

AUG 16 '48W

THE MONTH

JULY-AUGUST, 1948

Vol. CLXXXVI EIGHTY-FIFTH YEAR

No. 972

CONTENTS

COMMENTS	By the Editor	1
OPIUM FOR MARXISTS	By J. H. Crehan	12
PAUL CLAUDEL	By P. Messiaen	23
CARDINAL ALLEN'S ADMONITION II	By L. Hicks	30
LOST OASES	By T. B. Trappes-Lomax	40
ITALIAN SANCTITY: NORTH ITALY	By C. C. Martindale	45
MISCELLANEA		52

CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES.

A Pre-Columban Church in America.
Mr. David Jones' Watercolours.
The Franco-British Exhibition

REVIEWS 56

1.—(1) Goebbels Tagebücher. Ed. by Louis P. Lochner. (2) The Goebbels Diaries. Ed. by Louis P. Lochner. 2.—Philosophisches Wörterbuch. Ed. by Walter Brugger, S.J. 3.—St. Jane Frances de Chantal. By Janet Mary Scott.

SHORT NOTICES..... 29, 51, 55, 62

PUBLISHED BY LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LTD.
6 & 7 Clifford Street, London, W.1

EDITORIAL OFFICES :
114 Mount Street, London, W.1

MANAGER'S ADDRESS :
Manresa Press, Roehampton, S.W.15, to which Annual Subscriptions,
20s., post free (U.S.A. \$4.50), should be sent.

TWO SHILLINGS NET

All rights of translation and reproduction reserved.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
192247B

ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1949 L

IMPORTANT NOTICE

THE MONTH

A Catholic Review, conducted by the Jesuit Fathers, and edited
from : 114 MOUNT STREET, LONDON, W.1.

PUBLISHED BY LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LTD.
6 & 7 Clifford Street, London, W.1

THE MONTH WAS FOUNDED IN 1864, and among its earliest contributors were Cardinal Wiseman and Cardinal Newman, Newman's well-known *Dream of Gerontius* first appeared in its pages. It is now in its 85th year.

IN JANUARY, 1947, IT RESUMED MONTHLY ISSUES, after the restrictions of the war years. There will be

ELEVEN ISSUES EVERY YEAR

The July and August issues appearing together as one holiday number.

THE MONTH provides articles :—

ON SPIRITUAL AND RELIGIOUS SUBJECTS.
CATHOLIC THOUGHT.

MODERN PROBLEMS AND THE
BACKGROUND OF MODERN EVENTS.

Recent Contributors include the following :—

Most Rev. T. Roberts, S.J. (Archbishop of Bombay), Fathers C. C. Martindale, R. H. J. Steuart, James Brodrick, Maurice Bévenot, Bernard Leeming, F. C. Copleston, Leo Hicks and John Murray, S.J.

Also :

Rt. Rev. Mgr. R. A. Knox, Christopher Dawson, Arnold Lunn, A. C. F. Beales and Halliday Sutherland.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION

(From January, 1947) : £1 per annum (*eleven* numbers, post free).
Individual numbers : Two Shillings each (plus postage).

Orders and Subscriptions to : THE MANAGER,
MANRESA PRESS :: ROEHAMPTON :: LONDON, S.W.15

THE MONTH

VOL. CLXXXVI

JULY-AUGUST, 1948

No. 972

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

The Re-Making of Germany

THE period of transition from the World War, which ended in 1945, and the World Peace, which has not yet been achieved in 1948, has been gravely concerned with the problem of Germany. Looking backwards, it now appears evident that the Allied policy of unconditional surrender was a serious mistake. Whether it would have been possible to negotiate an armistice with some group in Germany other than the actual Nazi government, it is, of course, not easy to say. But the revelations of the trials at Nuremberg showed how there was a real Conservative opposition, both to the war and the Nazi régime, and that not one but many attempts were made by senior military officers to rid their country of its *Führer*. Had the Allies been Allies in spirit as well as temporary expediency, it might have been possible to recreate a Germany out of the war's ruins. But, in point of fact, all attempts to bring about a definite peace treaty with the German people have been shipwrecked on the rock of Russian ambitions with respect to Germany and Europe. Conference after conference tackled the question. Each time, the result was frustration and failure.

We have now reached the pass when the Western Powers realise that it is not possible to make some general arrangement for the whole of Germany, and yet it is quite impossible to leave the Germans as they have been for the past three years, split into four zones of occupation. Consequently, they have resolved, after much deliberation, to call into being a reduced Germany, the territories of which shall consist of the three Western and Southern occupation regions. This re-establishment of Germany, as the document of the Six Powers states, "in no way precludes, and on the contrary should facilitate, an eventual Four-Power agreement on the German problems arising out of the present situation in Germany. Because of the previous failure to reach comprehensive Four-Power decisions on Germany, the measures recommended mark a step forward in the policy which the Powers represented at these talks are determined to follow with respect to the economic reconstruction of Western Europe, including Germany, and with respect to the establishment of a basis for the participation of a democratic Germany in the community of free peoples."

Among the measures decided upon are these : a joint meeting between the military governors of the three zones and the Ministers and President of the *Länder* or provinces, which has now been held ; thereafter, the Ministers and President will be authorised to convene a Constituent Assembly to meet not later than September 15th to prepare the Constitution ; the Constitution has to conform to certain guiding principles, for the structure must be *federal* and so adequately protect the rights of the individual *Länder*, and yet provide a proper central authority.

As regards the Ruhr, an international committee is to be set up, including representatives of the United States, Britain, France, the Benelux countries, and Germany, on which committee the Benelux countries will each have one vote, while the four remaining peoples will enjoy three. This commission will decide what proportion of the Ruhr products of coal, coke and steel is to be used for German home consumption and what for export ; the essential requirements of Germany are to receive particular attention.

The Six-Power agreement also studied the matter of security. The American, British and United States delegations affirmed the determination of their respective governments that there would be no general withdrawal of their occupying forces from Germany, "until the peace of Europe is secured," and certainly no withdrawal without previous consultation. The three governments would consult together, should they have reason to fear any "danger of the resurgence of German military power." The policy of disarmament, demilitarisation and of control of the level of industry will be continued, and it was recommended that a board be established to carry out inspections. Finally, even after the period of occupation, "it was reaffirmed that Germany must not again be permitted to become an aggressive power and that prior to the general withdrawal of the forces of occupation, agreement will be reached among the governments concerned with respect to the necessary measures of demilitarisation, disarmament and control of industry and with respect to the occupation of key areas."

What is most important for the future, in these various paragraphs, is not so much the precautions that are laid down as the fact that a new Germany is emerging. It is a new Germany, in the sense that it is without Prussia. One might say it is the older Germany, before it became subject to Prussia's disastrous hegemony. One cannot expect that the Germans will be transformed overnight or that the deeply imprinted influence of Prussianism and National Socialism will easily vanish. None the less, there are great hopes that this new Germany, of more than forty million inhabitants, may find some proper framework for its economic and political life, and learn to collaborate with the other Western Powers. The policy of Russia in refusing to accept any agreement on Germany may find itself badly defeated in the struggle for Germany, an essential

phase in the Russian campaign for European mastery. Western and Southern Germany is the older Germany, the Germany of architecture and music, the Germany of the smaller kingdoms, principalities and prince bishoprics—the Germany which has made a great cultural contribution to the European heritage. The proportion of Catholics in the new State will be high, and the leading political party will be that of the Christian Democratic Union. After the disasters of the war, and the austerity of the last three years, these Germans have at last the chance of showing that they can make good, both for their own advantage and for the benefit of all peoples in Western Europe.

In his address at Cambridge in early June, Field-Marshal Smuts dwelt on the theme of Western civilization. "The peoples of Western Europe," he said, "have built up a culture and civilised way of life and thought which forms the proudest and most precious achievement of man, and remains the standard for the rest of the world to repair and to advance under." The Germans of this new German State—to West and South—have played their part in this achievement. Freed from the tyrannies and spurious mysticism of recent years, they have now an opportunity to show that they still understand to what civilisation they belong; and that they can work, and will be glad to work, with other peoples who have made their contributions to that same civilisation and are its heirs and guardians.

The Problems of the Catholic Church in Germany

THE position of Catholics in Germany has very considerably altered during the past thirty years, and especially throughout the last ten. Prior to 1914 it could have been said, roughly, that Germany was divided into Catholic and Protestant districts. This division was the legacy of the settlement made after the religious wars of the seventeenth century when, in effect, the subjects of German princes embraced the beliefs of their overlords. *Cujus regio, ejus religio*: this was the general key to the religious situation inside Germany. Accordingly, Bavaria, the Rhineland and Westphalia were regarded as fundamentally Catholic regions, while Thuringia, Saxony, Mecklenburg and Schleswig-Holstein were fundamentally Protestant.

This division was never water-tight. Peasants migrated into industrial areas; Catholic officials and civil servants would be sent to Protestant centres, and vice versa. A small Catholic *diaspora* came into existence, which meant that small groups of Catholics would be living in Protestant provinces, with no regular framework of Catholic parish churches. They needed religious help from outside. Some German dioceses, like Meissen and Berlin, had *diaspora* districts of their own, of which they took charge. Other *diaspora* centres were entrusted to dioceses to which the centres did

not territorially belong. Thus, the see of Würzburg cared for *diaspora* Catholics in one part of Thuringia, while the see of Fulda provided for another; Osnabrück had a *diaspora* section in Schleswig Holstein.

With the advent to power of the Nazi Government the *diaspora* problem became more serious. New factories were established; workers were transferred from one part of Germany to another. And the process set in motion by the Nazi re-armament programme was further and rapidly accelerated by the war. Cities were evacuated because of air bombardment; women and children were moved from large towns to country towns and villages. And at the end of the war millions of Germans were forced to move out of their homes; whole districts were occupied by the Russians, or taken over altogether by the Russians and the Poles.

As a result of this mass transference of the German population, the Church in Germany is faced with a new and extremely grave problem. In what were until recently Protestant provinces with nothing more than a small Catholic *diaspora* population, there are now between four and five million Catholics. Many of them have come to stay, since they have been expelled from the German *Sudeten* lands of Bohemia and from Silesia. According to figures compiled in 1946 and 1947, the diocese of Fulda, in Central Germany, has had an increase of 800,000 Catholics; the see of Hildesheim, an increase of more than 700,000 (this is three times the amount of the Catholic pre-war population of that diocese); Paderborn has more than 600,000 new Catholics, and Osnabrück more than 1,200,000 additional Catholics. Out of 900,000 immigrants into the Protestant province of Mecklenburg, 400,000 are Catholic, while 300,000 Catholics have settled in the Protestant region of Schleswig-Holstein. One area in Schleswig-Holstein, which contained 300 Catholics before the last war, now has 11,000. There is one country district in the diocese of Berlin, Demmin, which prior to 1939 could serve local Catholic needs through one church and one subsidiary chapel. To-day it has to deal with four towns and 220 villages, in which there has been Catholic settlement.

In what were formerly the Protestant areas of Germany, in the North, Centre and East, there are now, as I have mentioned, between four and five million Catholics. In Mecklenburg, 400,000; in Pommern and Brandenburg, belonging to the diocese of Berlin, another 400,000; in Saxony, in the diocese of Meissen, 700,000; Paderborn, 800,000; and there are 400,000 in Schleswig-Holstein and the Hanseatic cities.

Consequently, a new apostolic problem has been created for the German hierarchy of more than formidable proportions. In these Protestant districts are few established parishes; priests are lacking; there is no wideflung network of churches, chapels and mission stations. It will be exceedingly difficult to improvise for such

needs in the present conditions of Germany. The situation is further complicated by the fact that the previous *diaspora* Catholics lived mostly in large towns, since they were industrial workers or officials. But the war has taken a heavy toll of German cities, so that the majority of this new *diaspora* of Catholics is to be discovered in smaller country towns and villages. They are scattered over wide areas. Statistics from the Berlin diocese speak of 30 centres—in some cases of 70, 100, and even 200 centres—dependent upon one single Catholic mission station.

One needs little imagination to see the consequences of this new dispersion of German Catholics. Many of them cannot go to Mass or receive the sacraments. Many are buried without a priest, and the children remain unbaptised. Further, there are very few Catholic schools, and practically no religious houses. There is danger in the fact that most of these Catholics have come from Catholic districts where they enjoyed the advantages of Catholic surroundings and a Catholic atmosphere; they have not been educated and schooled to live the harder life of *diaspora* Catholics in unfamiliar and, at times, unfriendly conditions. Many are in danger of losing or neglecting their faith or of turning to Protestantism for religious consolation. Indeed some Lutheran pastors report that Catholic exiles are among the most regular attendants at Lutheran services.

Improvement in France

THE situation in France has greatly improved, both economically and politically, during the past nine months. M. Schuman's government, based upon a coalition of Socialists, Christian Democrats and Radicals, has shown itself energetic and effective in dealing with economic and social problems. It has insisted upon a programme of austerity which cannot have been popular, and it has challenged the French Chamber to a vote of confidence on several delicate issues.

Socially, there reigns greater stability. The Communist threat of a General Strike in December, 1947, was met firmly by M. Schuman. It is now clear that a normally-elected French government can function without Communist participation and can have the courage to resist Communist opposition through the Trades Unions. External events in 1947 have increased the Frenchman's feeling of recovery and stability. The alliance between France, Britain and the Benelux countries is looked upon as the herald of a new concert of Western Powers, in which France has a highly important part to play. The fact that, despite ancient prejudices and misgivings, the French government has agreed to the Six-Power Plan for Western Germany is an indication of France's genuine desire to work with her neighbours for the betterment of Western Europe. The American aid that will reach France through the Marshall Plan offers great hopes and high encouragement to the French.

Yet it is doubtful whether this central and moderate French government can long continue in office, at least with its present constituents. A little more than a year ago General de Gaulle founded the *Rassemblement du Peuple Français*, a movement intended to rise above political parties and to appeal to French patriotism. The movement has had an extraordinary success, and at the municipal elections of October, 1947, its candidates secured roughly 40 per cent. of the total votes. Since then, the de Gaullists have insisted upon the dissolution of the French Assembly, on the grounds that it no longer represents the true will of the people, and on fresh elections which will pave the way for an R.P.F. victory and government. One of the chief points urged by General de Gaulle is that the existing French Constitution needs drastic changes. It has, as a matter of fact, the direct approval of only one-third of the country, since in the referendum two-thirds voted against it or abstained. General de Gaulle has long insisted that what France needs, to safeguard it against the instability of previous French governments, is a constitution on the U.S.A. model, which makes the executive far more independent of the legislature than is the case in France. No doubt, a large number of Frenchmen are supporting General de Gaulle because of their anxieties over Communism. Should the French Communists receive orders from Moscow to organize civil disturbances, it is certain that de Gaulle would have an even greater backing.

The Spanish Question

IN recent weeks *The Times* has carried a correspondence about the rights and wrongs of Spain's exclusion from Western European co-operation and from the advantages of North American aid. For some time past I have insisted in these editorial pages that it is both illogical and unreal to boycott Spain from this common European plan when once the world was ready to include within its scope Soviet Russia and the countries where the Russians exercise their control.

Ideally, and in times less serious than our own, you might envisage a select group of "democracies" as the only true representatives of Western Europe. In that case you would be justified in not inviting Franco Spain. Spain to-day is not a "democracy" in the English or Dutch or Belgian sense. But once you are willing to work with governments like those of Stalin and Tito and Gottwald, then there is no conceivable principle on which you can properly exclude the government of General Franco.

Besides, the position of Spain in Western Europe is of the greatest strategical importance. It holds together the Western countries like a central arch, just as it bridges the Western Mediterranean between Europe and North Africa. Further, it is a significant bridgehead between the New world and the Old. Realities of

this kind cannot be long ignored ; and in point of fact the United States Government, for one, is not ignoring them. It might be embarrassing at first for members of the British and French governments to meet official Spanish representatives owing to the years of misunderstanding which lie between them. Embarrassment, however, is a small price to pay for the closer association of these countries which might arise from such meetings. There is little doubt that could this association be achieved it would have a moderating effect upon what are alleged to be the harsher features of the present régime in Spain.

Many recent visitors to Spain have declared that at the present moment there is no possible alternative to the Franco government, save a renewal of anarchy and civil war. It may be regretted that the system there has not grown progressively more "democratic" in the British sense, but the years since the Spanish Civil War have been difficult years for Spain as for the rest of Europe. An authoritarian government kept Spain out of the war, and it has preserved its country from the post-war upheavals of Communism. General Franco did what President Benes was not able to do ; he met and conquered the Communist challenge. It is, and will be, far easier for the Western European peoples to consolidate their position with Spain, under General Franco, than it would have been had the *Caudillo* of Spain been some Red commissar.

From Goebbels Diaries

SO often has it been declared that General Franco was, in effect, a fourth partner in the German-Italian-Japanese Axis that it is interesting to learn from the *Diaries* of Dr. Goebbels how the Germans themselves regarded him. Dr. Goebbels was in charge of all Germany's propaganda, and his views may be taken to reflect the opinions of the leading Nazis.

On February 1st, 1942, Goebbels comments upon an address of General Franco, directed to the Spanish people, in which he spoke of Spaniards as a people chosen by God and eternally loyal to the Catholic faith. "It would be a lot better for Spain," comments the 'little Doctor,' "if they would be loyal to the Axis Powers, for from the Catholic Church they are likely to have mighty few laurels. But Franco is a fanatical church-goer, and in point of fact Spain is not ruled by him, but by his wife and her confessor. A nice type of revolutionary, whom we have helped in our way to set upon his throne ! But none the less, it is better to have him there than some Bolshevik or other, who to-day without any doubt would be on the enemy's side."

On February 16th, Goebbels has a further remark on the Spanish *Caudillo* : "Franco gave a sharp talk against Bolshevism. It would be much more to the point if he declared war on Bolshevism. But what can you expect from that type of General ?" An entry for

March 10th refers to Franco's close association with the Catholic clergy and suggests that he has intentions of restoring the Spanish monarchy. Goebbels adds: "Franco is very second-rate. We mustn't expect much from him." A month later, on May 21st, Goebbels declares that never had a revolution led to such poor cultural and political results as that of Nationalist Spain. Franco, he states, is the prisoner of clerical reaction. Later in the same year, on December 20th, 1942, Goebbels mentions the North American propaganda against Franco and blames the General for what he considers his half-hearted and indecisive policy. "Had he attacked Gibraltar, when we wanted him to do so, his position to-day would be far more secure."

Finally, there is an extract from 1943, on March 19th. Here Goebbels again refers to a speech of the Spanish General in which a strong attack was made on Communism, but considerable scepticism was expressed as to the final outcome of the world war. Franco's opinion was that the war might continue for several years, and that in the last resort there might be neither victor nor vanquished nations. Franco, so noted Goebbels, is a "typical bourgeois coward," who talks a good deal but in the end takes no really active steps.

These various comments upon General Franco from the chief of the German propaganda may perhaps make us alter our opinion of Franco's attitude throughout the world war. Despite strong appeals to make common cause with the Axis Powers, whose situation on the Continent must have appeared at one period predominant and victorious, the leader of the Spanish government maintained neutrality. The Spanish Press had frequently to pay lip service to Germany when it bestrode the Continent like a Colossus, but the Spanish government carefully refrained from adding active help to its newspaper appeasement of the Germans.

A Serious Division

YET, when all this has been said, it has to be granted that the existence of the Franco régime in Spain has brought about serious differences of opinion among Catholics. To one side are those who would regard authoritarian governments, not as ideal, but as at least a practical guarantee of order and an effective bulwark against Communism. Better, they would say, to err on the side of authority, even if this should mean some loss of individual liberty and some arbitrary measures, than expose your country in times like these to chaos and revolution. So might a Spaniard have argued, comparing the Spain of 1945 and 1946 with France and Italy.

On the other side are the democratic Catholics. These insist that an authoritarian system is unlikely to last and that its advantages, if indeed they be advantages, are short-term and short-lived. In their opinion, such a system will probably be followed by a similar authoritarian régime of the opposite political colour. They urge

also that a system of this sort does not correspond with the teaching of the Church on social and political matters. Their point of view has been confirmed, they argue, by the great success of Christian democratic parties on the Continent, which are now playing the leading rôle in Western European countries and provide the most encouraging factor in the political recovery of Europe. The triumph of the Christian Democrats in the Italian elections is a great argument in their favour.

Some of them would go further and claim that political stability in European countries can be assured only through co-operation between these Christian democratic parties and the Social-Democrats. This broadly-based political "Third Force" would be strong enough to exclude and act against the Communists, and at the same time would resist "reactionary" influence. If this collaboration does not take place, there is real danger, they would argue, that the Christian parties themselves may be drawn too far towards the "Right" and so lose the popular character and support which they at present enjoy.

The arguments of these democratic Catholics are sound enough, though it would be unwise to apply them indiscriminately to any and every country. It does not follow that, because the Christian Democrats secured an overwhelming election victory in Italy, a similar party would have a similar triumph in Spain. Recent history in Spain and Italy has been very different—as different as is the Spaniard himself from the Italian. From the widespread criticism of the Franco régime one can disentangle scarcely any alternative suggestion in practical politics. It may well be that, on the Continent, Christians and Social Democrats can now co-operate more easily than was the case prior to 1939; though it must never be forgotten that the basis of Continental Socialism is Marxist theory. Yet, the Socialist position at the moment is ambiguous. In Italy the official Socialist Party of Signor Nenni made common cause, during the elections, with the Communists. M. Saragat's group, collaborating with the de Gasperi government, is a dissident one. Besides, in Eastern Europe many Socialists, high in their Party ranks, have capitulated to the Communists. And where the Christian and the Social Democratic parties have a clear field of opposition, without great interference from the Communists, as is the case in the Western zones of Germany, they are seen to be very wide apart in spirit and programme.

In these differences among Catholics there is accordingly need of restraint and understanding. Catholics in Britain have, on the whole, better understood, and had fuller sympathy with, General Franco than Catholics in France. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to speak of an estrangement between French and Spanish Catholics. On these grounds it would be good both for Europe and for Spain

if the present régime in Spain could gradually develop in a more liberal and democratic direction.

Finally, it should be said that this division on political matters between Catholics is very marked in some Latin countries of South America. In the Argentine, for instance, the Franco question is one on which opinions and sentiments are always definite and very divided. Especially among the more educated Catholics is there a sharp clash of political opinion which has impaired the solidarity of Argentine Catholics.

Soviet Pressure Upon Catholics

THE tactical approach of Communists to the Catholic Church in the various countries under Communist control in Europe varies considerably. In Yugoslavia an open persecution rages. The figures given from time to time by the *Osservatore Romano* make this abundantly clear. The number of priests functioning in the Yugoslavia of 1948 is little more than one quarter of the number that ministered to Catholics there in 1939.

In Hungary it is not yet a question of open persecution but of efforts, like those of the Nazis in Germany from 1933 to 1939, to rule out Catholic influence from public life and especially to take Catholic education out of Catholic hands. Earlier this year, M. Rakosi, the leader of the Hungarian Communists, declared that the time had come "to purge the educational system of reactionary elements" and "to stop the intolerable situation in which the core of the enemies of the Hungarian people hides behind the Church, and foremost the Catholic Church." The Hungarian government has now taken over all the schools, but promises to continue the compulsory religious education. This means the introduction of a uniform system of education, with new school textbooks, prepared with a Marxist slant and a Communist interpretation of history. How long the present religious instruction will in fact be permitted to continue in these schools, or what kind of instruction will be given under governmental control, it is difficult to say. But it is not difficult to appreciate the anxieties of the Catholic leaders in Hungary.

Discussions have been held between government officials and representatives of the Lutheran and Calvinist Churches in Hungary, which are also affected by the new school act. It appears that these Churches were not unwilling to accept the new system. At the end of March the Lutheran Bishop Szabó preached a sermon of conciliation, going so far as to declare that "those who speak of a persecution of the Church in Hungary to-day are either mistaken or wish to mislead others." The convocation of the Calvinist Church, which met on April 30th, decided upon complete collaboration with the government, recognized the Republic, and fully approved of the

new social order, including the land redistribution and the nationalisation of basic industries.

Catholics have, on the whole, shown a stiffer spirit. There have been some meetings between the Catholic authorities and government officials, but it is likely that Cardinal Mindszenty will insist upon certain conditions before discussions can result in any agreement. These conditions he has stated to be the following: diplomatic relations with the Vatican, freedom for Catholic associations, no government censorship of Catholic books, and a Catholic daily newspaper. The Cardinal has also protested against the many Communist insults to the Holy Father, especially since the Italian elections; one Communist deputy spoke in Parliament of Pius XII as "the Vicar of Capitalism on earth." Hungary is, to more than sixty per cent., a Catholic country. One can see how alien is the so-called new 'democracy' to the real spirit of the Hungarian folk when such insults are offered to the Pope in the Hungarian House of Representatives.

Similar evidence of the vigilance of the Polish hierarchy, in the face of Communist pressure, comes from a joint pastoral letter that was read in all Polish churches on Trinity Sunday. It was signed by the two Cardinals, three archbishops, and eighteen bishops and apostolic administrators. Addressed primarily to youth, which is the principal target of Communist attack, it warned the Polish people of the dangers of listening to a materialistic interpretation of history and of man's existence and purpose in life and of forsaking the teaching of Christ and the Catholic Church. The Church, it declared, will never agree to any system of education for Polish youth that ignores God, nor will it permit the teaching of God to be set aside. The letter spoke of materialism as a theory that "teaches hate, and recognises neither God's commandments nor the eternal moral laws nor Christian ethics." Without attempting to dissuade young people from understanding and performing their civic duties, the bishops assured them that the Church was determined to guard and direct them in the new Poland, as they had done in the past; they called upon youth to beware of "the flood of materialistic literature and propaganda," and to keep away from the "apostles of materialism."

While, in these weeks and months, our attention is particularly directed to Western European countries and their efforts to co-operate more closely for mutual benefits and defence, we must not forget the grand, even heroic, efforts made in countries under Communist control to preserve the Catholic faith and the Christian way of living. Our present concentration upon the problems of Western Europe must not render us inattentive or insensitive to the difficulties of Eastern Europe, nor allow us to imagine that these Eastern countries are any less European than those to the West of the Soviet "iron curtain."

OPIUM FOR MARXISTS

IT is too late now to keep the centenary of the phrase : Religion is the opium of the people. The opportunity for that passed in 1944, for it was in 1844 that Marx, rolling out the paradoxes as only a Hegelian could, delivered himself of the following sentiments : "Religious unhappiness is on the one hand an expression of real unhappiness, and on the other a protest against real unhappiness. Religion is the sighing of the oppressed, the soul of a heartless world, just as it is the spirit of a civilization whence the spirit has been banished. It is the opium of the people. To abolish religion in so far as it is a false happiness for the people, that is what their true happiness requires." Seen thus in its context the famous phrase is perhaps shorn of some of its power as a battle-cry. It is not that Marx denies *all* happiness to the people, or that he casts overboard the idea that men act for purposes rather than by blind impulse. His only care is to deny that they should seek religious happiness. No man willingly endures privation and long years of effort if there is no goal towards which he is supposed to be striving. Thus the classless society, which is the cant-term for the goal of the Marxists, has to be painted in soft roseate colours if it is to prove a lure. It cannot be a windless and changeless waste, such as Olympus the home of the gods used to be portrayed in antiquity, nor such a state of levelled and run-down energies as the physicists tell us the world will come to at the last. *Duc nos quo tendimus*, the Marxist is taught to pray : "Lead us, all ye Marxist heroes, and let us strive to advance ourselves by the way we are doomed to tread, unto that blessed land where classes shall be no more." The heaven is at work in humanity and will do its work, but it may be mixed up and stirred by human hand and hastened to its rising. The more the classes war, the quicker the dénouement.

It may not be without profit to examine the statements of true Marxian believers upon this crowning article of their creed. What have they to say about the happiness of the classless society? Who exactly is to be happy? The proletariat in their fading away and merging into the mass, or the liquidated capitalist, or both, or none? One who must now rank as the Origen among the patristic authorities of Marxian theology, Professor H. Laski, in his little handbook on *Communism* (Home Univ. Library, 1927), declares that faith is needed to grasp the truth of this matter : "We are here in the realm of prophecy ; and, with wisdom, neither Marx nor his disciples attempted to emulate the detailed and unconvincing Utopias fashioned by their predecessors. They were unanimous that the time required for the disappearance of the State would be long . . . but quite rightly they insist that neither time nor form for the completion of the new order can be given. All that it is possible to say is that the character

of the new society will be set by the formula : From each according to his powers ; to each according to his needs" (p. 163). The language is not very different from that of St. John in his first epistle : We are now the sons of God, and it hath not yet appeared what we shall be (1 Jn. 3. 2.). The Christian writer however has the advantage that his statement is part of a Christian revelation which is presented to the intellect as a whole with its arguments of credibility, so that the act of faith is not a blind assent, not the acceptance of what others tell us just because they have told it to us a hundred times, but a reasonable act freely made. Mr. Laski, departing from the line of strict Marxian orthodoxy, remarks (p. 178) that the formula of the classless society is incapable of precise meaning. " We cannot measure powers, especially in the realm of intellectual effort ; and the only criterion of needs that is possible is one that assumes a rough identity between men and the insistence that the claim of this identity upon the social product is the first charge we must recognise. We require in brief an objective test of powers and needs." But just as some of the Christian heretics kept the old formulas while boggling over their meaning, so the orthodox Marxist will repeat his cult phrases as if their very recitation was efficacious of itself, even though he be unable to explain their meaning.

" Communism partakes less of the character of scientific probability than of religious certitude. Different as it is in appearance it offers to its adherents much the same quality of prospect as Roman Catholicism or Mahomedanism. If the believer accepts its way of life, he can rest content in the assurance of an ultimate beatitude, with the difference that while the Churches can offer it to the individual the Communist can offer it only to some remote posterity" (ibid., p. 200). Here Professor Laski is not quite fair to the Roman Catholic position. As already noted, the faith of a Catholic is based upon a rational conviction that God has spoken, through Christ, in this and that sense, and that the message has been attested by signs and wonders, by the miracles of Christ and by His fulfilment of prophecy ; it is confirmed by the heroism of martyrs and buttressed by the existence of the Church, strong and unbroken through the tract of time from Christ's coming until now. As will be seen, the Communist belief is *not* quite rational, it has *not* been revealed by God but is rather a consequence of an irrational denial of God, its signs and wonders are the tawdry shams of material development at the cost of a very high price in human life, and so on. No Catholic dogma is, nor can be proved to be, contrary to reason, while the Communist main position is a denial of the immortality of the soul, which is a truth of reason. For the moment this fundamental irrationality of the Communist faith must be left to one side while the other signs used by Communists to show that their revelation can rightly claim the assent of the human mind must be examined.

Prophecy is an intellectual miracle. It appeals to the mind just as a miracle appeals to the senses. God in the miracle has inter-

vened to break, as it seems to our eyes, the ordinary course of nature and to attest by His presence the message of His chosen spokesman. When a prophecy is fulfilled in circumstances which exclude all mere guess-work or happy chance, there is a similar shock to the perceiving mind, which is staggered to find that an altogether inadequate cause, a man like ourselves, has spoken of what is still in the future and has been shown to be true by the event. To Origen and to the Christian intelligentsia of Alexandria, prophecy was preferable to a host of miracles as a sign of the divine assistance being given to God's spokesman. There is a similar fastidiousness about the Marxian. Marx was a prophet. In certain specific instances he spoke in prophecy. The year 1848 was to be the beginning of the end for capitalism. The war of 1870 was to be the prelude to a greater war between Russia and Germany. "A war of this kind will act as the midwife to the inevitable social revolution in Russia." So Marx could write on September 1st, 1870. The Marxist does not in the light of these prophecies go on to claim for Marx the inspiration of God, but he does appeal to them (cf. Deborin, in *Marxism and Modern Thought*, p.96) as a reason for accepting with faith the whole bloc of Marxian doctrine. Rather than say that God spoke through Marx, the disciples will say that Marx had somehow unearthed the laws of motion of society and that all which lesser men call his prophecies is simply the application with strict scientific accuracy of his laws of motion. One notices in the Marxian literature written before 1939 that the tendency of interpreters is to say that Marx foresaw the coming of the classless society after one World War, while the onset of World War II has caused these prophecies to be put back into the drawer so that other and more general statements on the death-throes of Capitalism may take their place. It is hardly to be doubted that for the ordinary rank-and-file Marxian the mental shock administered by the realization that Marx was a prophet is enough to produce the feeling of will-to-believe which precedes the pseudo-act of faith.

To some Marxian scientists such pseudo-religious attachment to the Marxian creed is repulsive, and they will not have it. Thus Bernal writes: "Many who have not examined, or who will not understand, consider that Marxism ceases to be a science and becomes a religion. The action of the Marxist is not undertaken as the result of a mystical or emotional appeal, or strengthened by mythological hopes and forces." (*Aspects of dialectical materialism*, p. 120.) This is very much on a par with what an unbelieving scientist might say of any religious faith: Faith must be based on myths, emotions and mysticism. Communism is based on science. One can imagine the displeasure with which such a mind would confront the more naïve statement of the Communist faith found, for instance, in the profession of faith of Emile Burns, made at the proletarian level in 1933: "There will be (in the classless society) no more social oppression of the type that finds its logical expression in pogroms and lynchings and beatings. The sweeping away of all barriers of nationality and

race brings in its train the liberation of immense positive forces, economic and cultural. In Communist society there will be no patent law, national or international. On the contrary, every advance will be not only theoretically available but will be brought by positive measures into the lives of countless millions. There will be a development of science and of every form of knowledge comparable only with the immense development of production. And the lives of all human beings will be enriched by the unrestricted cultural achievements of every nationality and race." (*Capitalism, Communism and the Transition*, pp. 271-272.) Bernal takes up the same attitude to this naïve faith that a Modernist might adopt to the orthodox Christian creed: "Dialectical Materialism does not and cannot claim to predict the times and details of events" (p. 118). He rejects the suggestion that the dialectic of thesis, antithesis and synthesis amounts to no more than a "a swinging to two extremes and a settling down to a middle course" (p. 149). If that had been true, then Marx's diagnosis of the process of history would have been no more than the rediscovery of the doctrine of the Mean. What *he* thinks is to be the outcome of the process is not a compromise but a third state, entirely different from its antecedents. "A mixture of oxygen and hydrogen has, it is true, intermediate properties from its components, but true synthesis occurs only in the explosive production of water with very different properties" (*ibid.*, p. 149). The new society is to be something totally different from its predecessors, to be achieved by conflict, not by compromise or by pooling the good qualities of the two opposite forms of Capitalism and Proletariat Dictatorship. About the nature of this society it would seem that a healthy agnosticism is to be adopted, without listening to the emotional appeal of any positive teaching about its happiness. Yet even in this dry and rarified atmosphere some trickling drops of consolation are allowed, for one is told that: "Having realized Communism, the world will have reached a new phase in its development, of an importance comparable with the appearance of life or of human society. The dialectical contradictions that have occupied the previous stages were social and economic contradictions. Those that will occupy the next stage will be of a different kind. The world of Communism will be a world of new liberties" (p. 121). But that is just what, from his preceding argument, one cannot know. When Catholic theologians undertake to say that supernatural life, given to the soul by grace, is like the life of the body, only better far, they are taken to task by the rationalist for indulging in pipe-dreams. How can the Communist who tries to be scientific and to do without faith escape the same charge?

It would seem then that the dogma which applies to the new world of Communism (from each according to his powers: to each according to his needs) cannot be proved by scientific reckoning, but must be held by a kind of bastard faith. That this is inevitable and not merely due to the accidental illogicality of the position taken

up by such Communist scientists as Bernal, may be seen from the assumptions it involves. They may be reduced to four: the idea of Progress, the denial of the immortality of the human individual, the assumption that society is more than the sum of its individual citizens, the denial of the freedom of the human will. None of these fundamental assumptions or denials can be established by reasoning, and so must be held on what, for the want of a better word, must be called faith. The first assumption, that the laws of motion of human society involve it in this progress to what is better, even through regress and temporary tribulation and conflict, is plainly made by all the dialecticians. It is true that they reject teleology or the seeking of ends. Let go the apple, and it falls to the ground, not because it wants to get to the ground, but because that is its law. In strict line with this rejection they can say with Bernal again: "All the teleology in modern physics is included in the second law of Thermodynamics, and it is only in this sense that Dialectical Materialism is teleological. If a social system which is involved with the internal contradictions produced by its own development changes, then it will change in general to another system which has for the moment fewer internal contradictions. In that sense and in that sense only is its future determinate" (ibid., p. 115). This is to accept the picture of the run-down, cold universe of scientific entropy, where *all's to one thing wrought*. But when one goes on from there to explain that of course the stage of development of society that is to come after the present revolutionary period will be better than the present, one is left wondering how a run-down stage is necessarily to be a better stage. The want-to-make-your-flesh-creep scientist would say that it will be a worse stage, and human nature, ever ready to believe the worst, prepares to believe him. Whence comes this care-ridding assumption that it will be better, but from some *mystique* to which the ordinary mortal has not the secret?

To one whose only care has been with scientific experiment, it may seem that mankind has always been beset with the conviction that the world progresses from worse to better, but a little acquaintance with history soon changes that perspective. When Christianity was young, the standing argument against its truth was that it was blamed for the steady deterioration of the world since its birth. Until the days of St. Augustine, men thought they detected in the world of their time presages of worse to come. By an easy application of the fallacy *Post hoc, ergo propter hoc*, they put the blame for this worsening upon the Christians. More than any other single work, it was the *City of God* of St. Augustine himself that checked this reproach. As in a true *peripeteia*, or change of fortune in a Greek tragedy, at the very moment of arrest of the one tendency the first shadow of the opposite tendency, which was itself to run to excess, began to appear in the writings of Pelagius, the first optimist and progressive. At various times there have been recrudescent outbreaks of gloom at the prospect of mankind, and it is not unreasonable to see in the

speculations which have followed upon the atom-bomb a sign that another such period is at hand. If that be so, then it will be all the harder for the true Marxian to cling to his article of faith in Progress, and there is no apologetic that will help him there.

The next assumption made by the Marxian is really double in aspect. Man is less than society, just because it is immortal while he is not. This revives an old error of the Arabian philosophers of the Middle Age, though whether it was Avicenna or Averroes who held it most certainly may be left for the disputes of the learned. The general argument for their view was somewhat as follows. If the power of intellect in man is not really his but is that of an intelligence which thinks in and with his brain, then at the decay of the brain and its final breakdown in death there is nothing to show that anything which may be truly called the man himself survives. The general intellect which used him may be said to have withdrawn, while all that was himself has perished. The matter may be illustrated by a comparison with broadcasting. If each human mind is no better than a receiving set, while the one mind which pervades the whole universe is like some great and powerful transmitter, then obviously the destruction of one or two receiving sets makes no difference at all to the transmitter; its broadcast will still be sent out and picked up somewhere. St. Thomas in his argument against the Arabians (principally in the *De Unitate Intellectus*, of which the late L. W. Keeler, S.J. produced a critical edition in 1936), makes the point that if the individual mind merely received the thoughts that were breathed into it by a universal mind, then those thoughts could not properly be called one's own. Now there is no conviction to which the individual mind can bid farewell with more trouble than this possession of its own acts. If that unique and original judgment of the *Cogito* is not a plain delivery of real fact, then it is impossible to know what fact is. And further, as long as an individual is the possessor of his own acts of thought, which are spiritual acts and not fleshbound by the trammels of sense, he can go on holding that his mind or spirit which did that work of thinking is non-material, and thus exempt from the law of material decay.

An attempt to rejuvenate the old Arabian denial of the human mind's independent existence has been made recently by John Lewis, who in a correspondence in *The Times Literary Supplement* (April 3rd, 1948), declared: "The immanent and all-present reason which penetrates the Universe rises in man to a height or climax in which it becomes the conscious law of liberty and truth." One must think here of the central intellect of the universe filling or inhabiting all things, rising only here and there, when a certain threshold has been passed, to the height of human reason and to the expression in man of the natural law. Now one begins to recognize the familiar outlines of Pantheist theory. If the intelligent power is one, with a strict unity, then all transgression of the natural law by human

beings is just a dream. The intelligence cannot be supposed to transgress its own law, and when man has the ineluctable conviction that he has broken that law, he must be said, on such a view, to be the subject of an illusion. The Pantheist here joins hands with the Logical Positivist for whom the statement: You did wrong by stealing that money, is equivalent to the simpler sentence: you stole that money, the only difference being that the second is uttered with a certain tone of scolding or reproach, which is merely an emotional addition. One cannot help thinking that all this attempt to evade the obvious fact of moral responsibility could not be maintained in practice. If the statement: You stole the money, is no more meaningful than: You took the money, and if for *money* one were to substitute the words *his wife*, then one fails to see why such philosophers do not at once begin to practise community of wives, as well as that of goods. If on the other hand the delivery of the human conscience that there are certain things a man is bound to do or to avoid can be accepted as fact, then the proffered explanation of the unity of intellect throughout the universe must be abandoned. A law implies two persons, the giver and the receiver, and the remorse a man experiences at having broken the natural law is not just the one intellect reproaching itself. After all, if it really *was* the only one, why should it? One would naturally have to bring in the idea of the analogy of being to complete the refutation of the Pantheist, but that idea of the Christian philosophy would need more extensive exposition than can be given here. What has been said is adequate to show that the assumption of a unified intellect pervading the universe is groundless.

The second aspect of this assumption about immortality is more boldly set forward by the Marxian, and is in itself less easy to detect as an assumption, because most philosophers have held views on the relation of society to the individual which were of their own finding, and there are few matters where more diversity of view could be found. Bukharin, even though he may now be on the *Index expurgatorius* of the Communist church, is a safe guide to the thought of Marx here. He says: "Society is not merely an aggregate of persons, constituting their sum. Society is more than a mere summation of its various Jacks and Jills. We have already seen that society is a real aggregate, a *system*; we have seen that it is a very complicated system of mutual interactions between the various persons, which interactions are extremely varied in quantity and quality. This means that society, as a whole, is greater than the sum of its parts" (*Historical Materialism*, p. 93). This is clearly the authentic doctrine of Marx who held that the relationships of man with man—and especially their economic relationship—somehow entered into the nature of the men who were so related, so that one could no longer see or think of the men apart from their industrial relationship one to another. Marx had in his younger days moments when this subordination of man to society repelled him, but the trend of his thought

was to be increasingly in the direction of emphasizing that subordination as he grew older. In Lenin, of course, the dehumanization of man has gone further. As Berdyaev has shown: "Lenin proclaimed that everything was moral which served the proletarian revolution. He knows no other definition of good. From this it follows that the end justifies the means, every sort of means. The moral impulse in human life loses all independent significance, and that is undoubtedly dehumanization. The end for the sake of which every means is justified is not man, not the new man, not the completeness of humanity, but only a new organization of society" (*Origin of Russian Communism*, p. 223). This exaltation of the one over the many has one awkward consequence for the Marxian faith. The individual whose longings for salvation through Marx have been aroused has now no prospect of their realization in his own person. All he can hope for, all that the opium-dream will allow him to hope for, is a vague new world which will certainly not be *his* new world, but will be the preserve of humanity as such. Of course, at the popular level of the Marxian catechism or the youth handbook, the blessings of the new society (in which the State has withered away and classes are no more) are held out to the individual. Thus in a tract written for members of the Young Communist League and entitled: *The Progress of Man*, one can read on p. 18, after a glowing account of Soviet universities and the like, the words: "What couldn't we do with Socialism here? Just think of it. If all those opportunities were open to us, the youth of Britain, what wouldn't we be able to do? And they *can* be and *must* be, *because we ourselves will see to it.*" *Quod visurus sum ego ipse et non alius.* . . .

It is obvious that when the individual Marxian believer finds that his personal hope of salvation is illusory, the *crise de la foi* which ensues may be sharp, and may lead to his forsaking the faith of his adoption. The way in which this crisis can be overcome differs, no doubt, from individual to individual, but there are certain general lines on which a solution may be attempted, all of them calling for still greater faith. For Russians, the magic of the word *Sobornost* may be invoked. This idea goes back to a theologian of the Orthodox Church, Khomyakov, who was roughly a contemporary of Marx. He took the word *Sobornost*, which was used in the Slavonic version of the Creed for the *Ecclesia Catholica*, and used it as the central point of his theological system. He borrowed freely from the German idealist Schelling as well as from his own Orthodox predecessors. He held that as the Protestant churches had erred by exalting liberty, and as—to his mind—the Roman Catholic Church had erred by exalting unity, his theology of the Orthodox church would show that in it was to be found the ideal synthesis of the two, the liberty and the unity of *Sobornost*. The traces of Hegelian dialectic are plain to see, but the idea has had some fortune amongst Russian thinkers both before and after the Revolution, and seems to possess for some an almost mystical appeal which might reconcile them to the loss

of their own individual happiness, if at the same time they could rest content that they were labouring and suffering to produce this higher unity and free society, not now for Christian Catholicism but for Marxian orthodoxy, wherein each should be for all and all for each.

For the Western mind, to which *Sobornost* makes no immediate appeal, other motives are needed to induce the state of readiness to sacrifice all for a cause that is impersonal and abstract. Anything like a nationalistic *mystique* of the 'blood and soil' variety must be avoided. As Stalin says: "The question of the right of nations is not an isolated, self-sufficient question; it is part of the general problem of the proletarian revolution, subordinate to the whole and must be considered from the point of view of the whole" (Stalin, *Foundations of Leninism*, pp. 68-70). Denied the appeal to nationalist sentiments, the only resource left to a man is the appeal to faith and to spiritual motives of a Marxian kind; for certainly to desire bread for another is a spiritual desire, however material may be the desire of bread for oneself. St. Thomas thought that, in helping our fellow-men, we were moved by the image of God which we saw and loved in them, and thus ascribed man's altruism to his love of God. The Marxian view cannot thus call on God to make possible the transition from the selfishness of human nature to the altruism needed for the prolonged quest of the classless society. As Croce said long ago of the Marxian concept of the leap from the reign of necessity into that of liberty (or the classless society): "Ideals cannot be proved. . . . Great characters in history have had the courage to dare. *Alea iacta est*, said Caesar; *Gott helfe mir, amen!* said Luther. The brave deeds of history would not be brave if they had been accompanied by a clear foresight of the consequences" (*Historical Materialism*, pp. 97 and 105). The claim of courage upon a man of spirit will account for a good part of the loyal service given to the ideal of the classless society by those who realize all the time that it is not for themselves that they are building. The sharp sting of hatred may replace the lack of love in others, for the Marxian is warned that the leap from class-war to classless society may come suddenly, like a thief in the night. In both of these cases, however, something which can only be called, as before, bastard faith is needed to activate the springs of human conduct.

The last assumption that the Marxian is required to make is the denial of freedom of the will. This may sound strange to the Marxian himself who has been taught to look upon his new millennium as essentially a freer existence than the present state of man. Berdyaev tells of a Russian workman who came to France before 1939 and who soon began to pine for his homeland because, as he said, France was not a free country. When asked to say what he understood by freedom, he explained that in France every day was like its predecessor, while in Russia every young man felt himself a world-builder. "The world had become plastic and out of it new forms might be modelled."

This might happen any day, and each one felt himself a partner in the great new enterprise. This liberty is what philosophers call the liberty of spontaneous action and it is the property of radio-active substances ; it is not liberty of choice. For granted that any day might usher in the new state of the world—and are not the days to be foreshortened because of the elect?—even so, the new form that all will co-operate in bringing into being is not chosen by those who bring it about ; neither in the mass nor in any detail is it the subject of a human choice. *Duc nos quo tendimus* was set down earlier in this article as the Communist's daily prayer. Of course, if society is more than the individuals who make it up, then the lack of freedom of choice on the part of individuals is a minor matter in comparison with the progress of the world-revolution. So far it is the modern controversy about freedom which has concerned us in this last point, but for Marx himself the denial of human free-will was made on other counts. He inherited from Hume—whether directly or not is of little consequence—the idea that laws that governed human nature could be discovered just as accurately as the laws of motion which Newton had elaborated for inanimate nature. This idea carried with it the denial of human freedom. For Hume this was easy, as he had an explanation of the springs of human conduct which reduced conduct to a matter of national taste : “ If a man have a lively *sense* of honour and virtue, with moderate passions, his conduct will always be conformable to the rules of morality. On the other hand, where one is born of so perverse a frame of mind . . . as to have no *relish* for virtue and humanity . . . such an one must be allowed entirely incurable ” (Treatise III, i, 1). This introduction of determinism and the conversion of ethics into a branch of physics suited Marx entirely, and he exulted in the realm which he saw before him. It is not true in fact to make of Marx an anticipator of the new physics of Indeterminism and to say that he did not expect his predictions about the behaviour of human nature to be more than good generalizations (as Bernal does), for he looked on them as possessing the same certainty and accuracy as the Newtonian laws. When the phenomena of radio-activity came to be more closely investigated, then it was that the cast-iron rigour of the laws of physical nature was seen to be a delusion. They sank to the level of good general statements, and with their loss of status passed the hour of the old mechanist Determinism. If a small quantity of radium passes its life throwing off particles at irregular and incalculable intervals with all the appearance of spontaneity, then human beings, who are after all somewhat higher in the scale of being, cannot be said *a priori* to lack freedom of choice, by which is meant something more than the mere spontaneous throwing out of actions in this direction or in that. Hegel's attempt to explain Julius Caesar's conduct in terms of thesis, antithesis and higher synthesis was a dismal failure. The attempt of Hegelian theologians to explain the rise of Christianity in the same terms, as Jewish thesis, Gentile antithesis

(under Paul's leadership) and higher synthesis (which made of Christians the third race), has now gone to the Limbo of unredeemed abstractions. The Marxian *credo* can only keep its hold if it be adhered to with blind faith.

In the planning of his *Utopia* St. Thomas More wrote that King Utopus had made one reservation to his general law of toleration. He had set forth a strict prohibition against the holding of any view which so belittled the dignity of man as to maintain that the soul died with the body or that the course of the world was due to chance rather than to providence, for without these two truths of natural reason no good governance of a state was possible: "Sancte ac severe vetuit ne quis usque adeo ab humanae naturae dignitate degeneret ut animas quoque interire cum corpore aut mundum temere ferri sublata providentia putet" (More, *Op. Lat.* p. 16, edition of 1566). The man who holds such views is forbidden to dispute of them with the uneducated, but is allowed to bring forward his reasons and to dispute with the Utopian priests. The contrast of this with the Marxian tactic is clear. In Utopia mass-propaganda for materialist ideas is forbidden, but their discussion at a higher level is allowed. The Marxian will engage all his energies in mass-propaganda for materialism, while its discussion at higher levels is disallowed. It is well known that Lenin poured scorn, a scorn that was intermixed with fear, upon the idea that Communism was another religion with its own creed, its own demand for faith, its own doctrine of the Last Things (or eschatology), and its own priesthood, though he would allow the use, before a mob, of such language as: Socialism is my religion. . . . After all, the lower classes have need of opium; but if the lower classes need it, how much more those who are to lead them!

As has been shown with perhaps some appearance of truth, the fundamental articles of the Communist creed cannot be held as reasonable conclusions and rest on faith alone. Dostoevsky saw further into the nature of the creed when he wrote of Alyosha Karamazov: "If he had decided that God and immortality did not exist, he would at once have become an atheist and a socialist. For socialism is not merely the labour question; it is before all things the atheistic question, the question of the form taken by atheism to-day, the question of the tower of Babel built without God, not to mount to heaven from earth but to set up heaven on earth." (For the nineteenth century term *socialism* in the above one should now read *communism*, as is obvious). The Cardinals of the Roman Church, whose duty it is to interpret with authority the canon law of the Church, are also of the opinion that Communism is a religion; for in 1934 they decreed that all those who have been enrolled in an atheistical association are to be subject to those provisions of the law which govern the marriage or ordination of those who belong or have formerly belonged to a non-Catholic religious sect.

J. H. CREHAN.

PAUL CLAUDEL

FRANCE, in the first half of the twentieth century, has produced four great poets : Péguy, Claudel, Valéry, Apollinaire. Of these four poets the most direct is Péguy, the most melancholy Apollinaire, the most refined Valéry, the widest and most powerful Claudel.

Paul Claudel is now eighty years old. He is a big sturdy man making one think of an old farmer smoking his pipe. His voice is manly, strong rather than delicate ; his accent smacks of Northern France, a mixture of Picardie and Lorraine.

He was born on August 6th, 1868, at Villeneuve-en-Tardenois, between Laon and Rheims, a flat and wealthy country with plenty of wind, big farms, big horses and big cows, plentiful crops of wheat, lucerne and sugar-beet ; everywhere old churches and old abbeys. He is the son of a village notary. His country boyhood has deeply impregnated Claudel. He has travelled a good deal, seen the sea, Asia, America. Most of his metaphors and comparisons are drawn from rustic life, from village crafts. He loves a thick field of wheat with big ears, an orchard of apple-trees bending under their apples, a wine heavy with the fragrance of grapes, a butcher carrying half an ox on his shoulders. He loves the village steeple ringing the Mass and the angelus, he loves the churchyard round the church. In *L'Annonce faite à Marie* the Combernon farm is a farm of the Middle Ages, and a farm of to-day, where people work hard, eat and drink deep, have the sense of money and the sense of God.

It has been said that Claudel is a poet *de plein air et de globules rouges*. He also is a lover and a Catholic *de globules rouges*. He is not classic, he is more robust than refined, more abundant than measured. He has read Homer and Virgil, Corneille and Racine, but he likes much better the Bible, Dante, Shakespeare, Verlaine, Rimbaud. Mme Claudine Chonez has written : " Claudel's syntax worries the majority of French people." This was perhaps true some thirty years ago ; it is no longer true nowadays. Thirty years ago very few of us students at the university of Lyons were buying with our pocket-money Claudel's new books ; at the same date a performance of *L'Annonce faite à Marie* drew a very small audience. To-day, when a play of Claudel is staged you have to book your seat a week in advance.

By his vocabulary and his verbal flux Claudel belongs to the line of the geniuses who reject limitations : Rabelais, Pascal, Hugo, Balzac. He has never written regular verse, regular stanzas. His poetry is a rhythmical prose, cut out into verses similar to the Biblical verses. The only modern French writer that can be compared to

Claudel as to form is Rimbaud, the Rimbaud of the *Illuminations* and of the *Season in Hell*.

I do not know whether Claudel appreciated Valéry. There are not two writers more different; Valéry, the rigorous rationalist proceeding from the Renaissance, the refined Southerner delighting in the laws of traditional prosody; Claudel, the latinised Northman, issuing from the village, the monastery, the Bible, permeated with theology and liturgy, having a deep horror and a deep contempt for scientism and for art for art's sake. Claudel is an apostle and a missionary as well as a poet.

He came from a very slightly Christian family. He studied at the lycée Louis-le-Grand (1878-1885), at a time when Michelet, Renan and free thought were the fashion. His best school fellow and best friend through life was Philippe Berthelot, the son of the renowned chemist. Both entered the diplomatic service. Philippe Berthelot was, for some twenty years, the director of affairs at the Quai d'Orsay. Claudel was consul, secretary of embassy, ambassador at Shanghai, Peking, Rio de Janeiro, Tokio, Washington, Brussels.

He has an immense culture; he has translated Chinese and Japanese poems, Eschylus and Coventry Patmore; he has written commentaries on the book of *Ruth*, on the book of *Job*, on St. John's *Apocalypse*. Like Bossuet he must know the Bible by heart from end to end.

He has an immense wealth of vocabulary. You find all sorts of languages in Claudel: the dialect of his province, the slang of the people who have travelled, the technical terms of the farmer and of the sailor, of philosophy and exegesis, of theology and liturgy.

He has written immensely: dramas, lyrical poems, all sorts of essays in prose. A few critics say that he has written too much. But the same thing has been said about Balzac and Hugo. In Claudel, as in Balzac and Hugo, there are undisputed masterpieces; there are also unequal works.

The great event in Claudel's life and poetry was his conversion, on Christmas night, 1886. He had entered Notre-Dame to attend the midnight Mass; there he had a revelation, he felt a call of God; returning home through the dark and rainy streets he realised that he had to be a Catholic, to devote to Catholicism all his life and all his activity. It took him four years fully to accept the Catholic dogmas, practice and liturgy. He has written: "The state of a man suddenly drawn out of his skin to be planted into a foreign society in an unknown world is the only comparison that can express my moral bewilderment. I knew the story of Jesus only through Renan; I even ignored that Jesus had ever said that he was the son of God." The writers that helped Claudel most in his conquest of the faith were Rimbaud, Pascal, Bossuet, Dante, Dostoevsky, Catherine Emmerich, Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, above all the Bible and

the ritual of the Church. In 1890, after reading Baudelaire's *journals*, he confessed and received communion and, upon his confessor's order, informed his family of his conversion: "an occasion," he says, "which gave me a cold sweat."

Claudél has always said that he is not a mystic. Here we beg to contradict him and to state that he is above all a mystic. He feels and meets God and Christ and the Redemption everywhere, in the frame of the universe, in the heart of man, in the providential history of mankind. God's fundamental law, according to Claudél, God's flame, is love; when we follow that flame we obey God; when we do not follow it we hate God, we revolt against God; and then that flame turns against us. Hence the torments of Satan and of the damned, they are torments of hatred. The part of the poet, of the artist, is to reveal that divine flame all through creation, in the harmony of the stars and of the sea, in the beauty of flowers and of women. How many dazzling pages has not Claudél written about the glories of nature, chiefly of the rising sun and of moonlight. With him as well as with the Psalmist, *coeli enarrant gloriam Dei*. But Claudél is no pantheist; he is catholic, cosmic, *Christocentric*. He has invectives only against all negators, preachers of darkness, blasphemers. But he has no insults for Rimbaud, "a deviated seeker of God."

Claudél's conception of love is quite the contrary of a Puritan's or a Jansenist's. He has always said that love is physical as well as spiritual. In one of his odes he sings the happiness of the man who holds his beloved one; in another ode he exclaims: "What does it avail to be a woman if not a woman between the arms of the man she loves?" He has sung the happiness of having shouting and kicking children.

Marriage, human love, such is, according to Claudél, the part of common men in the frame of God's creation. But there are uncommon men of whom God, for supernatural purposes of purification and apostolate, asks to be more closely like Christ and the blessed Virgin. Those uncommon men and women are called by God to sacrifice, to physical and moral suffering, to holiness. These are the men and women whose destinies Claudél has called up in his theatre. Here are a few notes about some of Claudél's plays which I have recently re-read.

The play *Tête-d'Or* is Claudél's first drama, written in 1889-1890, revised in 1894-1897. There are reminiscences of the story of Joan of Arc and of Shakespeare's tragedies. The hero saves his country from foreign invasion, kills the king, becomes a sort of dictator; saves his country a second time, but is mortally wounded after rescuing the king's daughter whom one of his officers has nailed to a tree. *Tête-d'Or* is not a directly Christian drama. It has never been put upon the stage.

L'Annonce faite à Marie, first called *La jeune fille Violaine*, written in 1892 and several times revised, is looked upon by everybody as Claudel's finest work. It is as coloured as a window of Chartres or of Bourges, as tragical and as overflowing with lyricism as Shakespeare's greatest tragedies; it is as deeply Christian as a mystery of the Middle Ages. There are five great characters: Pierre de Craon, the church-builder, suddenly caught by the spirit of evil and by leprosy; the old farmer who suddenly starts on pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and his wife, Elisabeth, the good housekeeper, who does not understand her husband's unexpected religious zeal; Violaine, the beautiful girl, then the leper, chosen by God for suffering and holiness; Violaine's sister, Mara the dark-skinned, who steals her sister's fortune and fiancé, a kind of female Iago, who gets her child raised from death by Violaine and kills Violaine by dropping on her a cart-load of sand; Jacques Hury, the man of the plough and of the cornfield, bewildered to be thrown amidst that struggle between good and evil. There are some ten sublime scenes. The beauty and the lyricism of the style remind one of Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* and *Winter's Tale*. *L'Annonce faite à Marie* is one of the glories of French, of Catholic literature. It ought to be a classic in all our colleges and schools.

Some people place almost as high *L'Otage* and *Le Partage de Midi*. They are unequal works. *L'Otage* contrasts the heroine of old Catholic France, Sygne de Confontaine, and the representative of new republican France, Toussaint Turelure, inspired, they say, from Fouché, the minister of police under the Revolution and Napoleon. In order to save the Pope, then a prisoner of Napoleon, Sygne accepts to marry Turelure who has guillotined her father and mother; she even gets killed for him. Again a choice soul crushed by God for the redemption of men. The finest scene of the play is the one where the village curé explains to Sygne that the perfect Christian imitates Christ thoroughly, performs more than the law, sacrifices himself beyond the law; and that therefore, for the greater good of France and of the Church, she must marry Turelure although she does not love him. It is a grand, severe scene; many have found it revolting. When we attended the play my wife began to cry, and kept repeating: "No, no, she must not marry that man. God cannot want such a thing." The symbolism is obvious: old Catholic France must accept Republican France so that she may remain the eldest daughter of the Church.

Le Partage de Midi, written between 1900 and 1919, only published in 1948, begins like a drama of Somerset Maugham or Eugene O'Neill. The action takes place on board a great liner in the Indian Ocean. Three men round one woman, Ysé, who is a beauty and the mother of several children; an insignificant husband, a timid lover, a brutal and bold lover. They arrive in China. The husband is killed;

Ysé becomes the mistress of the timid lover and then of the bold lover. A revolution breaks out. Ysé and the timid lover perish together after a long lyrical sermon about love recalling the sermons between Tristan and Isolde in Wagner.

The *Soulier de Satin*, performed with immense success at the Comédie-Française during the German occupation, brings us back to the atmosphere of *L'Annonce faite à Marie*. But it is a less coherent work; it is a sort of *hold-all* where the drama is overloaded with historical considerations and contemporary allusions. The historical considerations on Spain as the missionary of Catholicism in Latin America, on the Protestant rôle of England in Northern America, and on Germany that broke the unity of Christendom, are accurate. But, so to say, they drown the drama itself. It is the same with all the references to the neo-paganism of the Sorbonne; and to the ugly statuary of St. Sulpice. The drama is not there; it is in the impossible love between don Rodriguo, the viceroy of America, and doña Prouhèze, first married to a Spanish lord, then to a Christian renegade in Morocco. Their love will remain platonic here below and will be accomplished and happy in the life to come. The *Soulier de Satin* is the counterpart of the *Partage de Midi*. There are as high sublimities as in the *Annonce faite à Marie*: the opening scene where a Jesuit crucified on a buoy proclaims the devotion of the missionary; the scene where doña Prouhèze tenders her white satin shoe, the emblem of her purity, to the Virgin Mary; the dialogue between Prouhèze and her guardian angel; the last interview between Rodriguo and Prouhèze. But on the whole *Le Soulier de Satin* has not the dramatic and sustained intensity of *L'Annonce faite à Marie*. It is too dispersed, too baroque. The version staged at the Comédie-Française was an abridged version.

I believe that for our grandsons Claudel as a playwright will be known chiefly as the author of *L'Annonce faite à Marie*.

To Claudel's voluminous work in prose the best initiation is perhaps the two volumes of selections published in 1946 and 1948, by Father Blanchet, S.J. The first volume is divided into six chapters: *Le poète devant l'univers*, *La connaissance poétique*, *Problèmes de métier*, *Portraits et jugements littéraires*, *La religion*. I need not add that, like most great poets, Claudel is a great prose writer, of the same line as Bossuet, Rousseau, Chateaubriand, knowing how to build up and to balance majestic periods loaded with ideas and motion.

Claudel thinks that the universe and life and man are for the unbeliever empty of harmony and finality; whereas for the Christian there is an interpenetration, a coincidence and correspondence of being and knowing. He writes in his book *Positions et propositions*: "The object of poetry is not dreams, illusions or ideas. It is that holy reality in the centre of which we are placed. It is the universe of visible things, to which Faith adds the universe of invisible things.

All that is God's work and makes up the inexhaustible matter of the narratives and songs of the greatest poet and the smallest bird. And elsewhere : " Let my verse be like the sea-eagle rushing on a big fish ; nothing is seen but a dazzling whirl of wings and the splash of the foam."

There is an etymological and metaphysical pun which Claudel has often repeated and developed : *connaître* is akin to *co-naître*, *cognosco* to *nascor*, *gignosco* to *gignomai*. Knowledge reaches, reflects and revives, the very substance of being ; in the universe organised and governed by God's providence there is no breach ; there is a continuousness between matter and spirit.

From the lack of belief, thinks Claudel, proceed all the faults and despairs of modern art, the blasphemies and wailings of romanticism, Poe's and Baudelaire's morbidity, Mallarmé's impotency and renouncement, and such myths as the sacrifice of man to nature, to progress, to evolution. Catholic religion restores to art its true function which is to represent, understand, praise, enjoy the universe and life ; the Christian artist does not lose his soul in a dark ocean measureless to man ; he can study all passions, he has an immense field of investigation and emotion. Similar ideas have been set forth by F. Thompson and G. K. Chesterton in England, by Giovanni Papini in Italy.

Among the artists who have gone over that field of investigation, Claudel quotes five writers whom he calls imperial : Homer, Eschylus, Virgil, Dante, Shakespeare ; a musician like Beethoven ; such painters as Rubens, Rembrandt, el Greco, Velasquez, Goya ; and the architects and window-makers of the Middle Ages. He writes about Beethoven : " His biographers, always so silly, dwell upon the loves of the poor great man. These matter only as momentary stings. With his feet upon the world and his ears closed to all noise, Beethoven within his heart listens to the lost paradise."

But Claudel's greatest pages are those dealing with the Bible, chiefly in the volume : *Un poète regarde la croix*. I wish I could quote entire the pages entitled *Au Calvaire : ce qui se passe entre le Fils et la Mère*. The theme is that Mary on the Calvary does not cry but stands, *stabat*, because she has something else to do than to weep ; she has to learn her catechism, she has to attend the first Mass, she has to sing the new *Magnificat*. And I should like to quote the pages about the good thief, the first man arriving in paradise, " like one who is alone in a cathedral."

I wish that Father Blanchet would prepare an anthology of Claudel as a lyrical poet. There again one might say that Claudel has written too much. The future no doubt will treat this poet as we are now treating Hugo, Verlaine, Mallarmé ; it will separate the grain from the chaff. I have read the volume of the five great odes, and other volumes ; they are unequal, sometimes sublime or exquisite,

sometimes superabundant and verbose. Among the flowers of Claudel's lyrical genius a choice must be made, a choice like the one which I remember was suggested by that intuitive actress, Eve Francis, who played the parts of Violaine and of Sygne de Confontaine. Her favourites were the poem about *Verlaine*, the poor drunkard who is our most delightful poet of love and repentance; the poem about *St. Francis Xavier*, that small brown Jesuit with worn-out shoes and stockings who undertook the conquest of Asia with no other weapons than his crucifix and breviary; and *La Vierge à Midi*, that gem of purity and tenderness, as deep as Villon's or Verlaine's prayers to Our Lady:

Il est midi. Je vois l'église ouverte. Il faut entrer.
Mère de Jésus-Christ, je ne viens pas prier.
Je n'ai rien à offrir et rien à demander.
Je viens seulement, Mère, pour vous regarder,
Vous regarder, pleurer de bonheur, savoir cela
Que je suis votre fils et que vous êtes là . . .

The best study of Claudel is Jacques Madaule's volume *Le drame de Paul Claudel*, Paris, Desclée de Brouwer. 1948

PIERRE MESSIAEN.

SHORT NOTICE

So far as we can judge, this summary of Fr. J. De Marchi's great book on Fatima (*The Crusade of Fatima*: arranged from the Portuguese "Uma Senhora mais brilhante que o Sol" by A. C. Branco and P. C. M. Kelly, C.S.C., pp. xii, 177. Price not marked. P. J. Kenedy and Sons, New York, 1947), is the best document to make use of if something shorter is wished for, and we think, of course, that popular accounts of the apparitions at Fatima are fully justifiable. And this one is sober and does not 'romanticise' the story it relates. Still, we feel that more than ever necessary is an absolutely accurate collation of all the various reports and a final decision as to the authentic form of the messages given to the children. Thus when Lucia asked about the destiny of her little friend Amelia, we are told that she heard: "She is in Purgatory": "She is still in Purgatory" (so this book): "She is in Purgatory till the end of the world" (emphasised in another American book on Fatima, though following earlier sources). We want to know who added those last words, if they are not original; or who decided to excise them, if they were. So all the way through. Devotion cannot be better served than by strict veracity; "Say all that is true," declared Leo XIII, "and nothing that is not."

CARDINAL ALLEN'S ADMONITION

II

IN a former article¹ an account was given of the special circumstances that led to Allen composing his Admonition to the Nobility and People of England and Ireland, as well as of some of the charges brought against Elizabeth and her Government in that booklet. These included reasons against her claim to the throne; particularly the baseness of her birth; her attempt to uproot the old Faith by imposing on the people a new religion; her destruction of everything pertaining to Catholic worship and devotion; her assumption of ecclesiastical supremacy, which in a woman he characterised "ridiculous, absurd, monstrous, detestable and a very fable to posterity"; her perjury at her coronation when she took the oath to defend the Church, its rights and privileges, which English sovereigns had for centuries taken, though by the Device for the Alteration of Religion and other documents as well as by her immediate subsequent conduct it is clear she had no intention of keeping that oath; her harsh treatment of the Catholic bishops, which is proved by contemporary documents despite Burghley's mendacious denial of the same; and finally her abasing of the old nobility and her advancement "of base and impure persons, inflamed with infinite avarice and ambition, men of great partiality, bribery and iniquity, to the highest honours and most profitable offices of her court and country."

His next observations were directed against the bishops and clergy of the newly established state religion. "She hath intruded," he writes, "the very refuse of the worst sort of mortal men, infamous amorous apostates and heretics, to all the spiritual dignities and preferments of the realm, who by their insatiable covetousness, and concupiscence, have made lamentable havoc, waste and destruction of the ancientest (well nigh) and honourablest spiritual state in Christendom, herself not a little helping to the spoil of the same." Allen, it may be remarked, was ever severe in his denunciation of the Elizabethan state-bishops and clergy. He had already written of them in phrases similar to the above in his *True Sincere and Modest Defence*.² That as a body they merited severe censure is beyond question. Pluralism, simoniacal transactions, spoliation of the property belonging to the Church in order to provide for their families and dependants, place-hunting and money-grabbing were rife among the higher clergy. As with the laity so with them there prevailed a general spirit of covetousness. Even Parker, who in general appears

¹ THE MONTH, April, 1948.

² Cf. 1914 ed., Vol. I, pp. 57 and 60, and Vol. II, p. 97.

to have had clean hands in the matter died a man of considerable wealth. The Queen,¹ though she herself was second to none in despoiling the church, did not relish the bishops imitating her example, and endeavoured to put a stop to one phase of it by legislation. Of the Protestant bishops appointed at the beginning of the reign, Professor Kennedy writes: "Parker perhaps alone excepted, they were actuated in their outlook by material considerations. Not a few of them neglected the burden of diocesan rule, while they sought their personal ease."² Again, referring not merely to the early years but to the whole reign he remarks: "This must be said, there were grave scandals among the Elizabethan episcopate, but it is possible to trace the gradual emergence of a higher type which touched hands with Parker."³ To judge, however, from the lives of the later bishops, as depicted by F. O. White⁴ from the contemporary documents, the emergence of a better type was, to say the least, extremely gradual.

As for the morals of the clergy, Professor Kennedy writes: "It is well known that questions in visitations were largely based on extant conditions, while visitations prohibitions were always the outcome of enquiries. Thus then, both negative and positive evidence goes to show that over a wide area of parishes there was much to be deplored in the state of clerical morality during the reign. I have confined myself to evidence drawn from Protestant sources. When foreign reports and the books of Catholic controversialists are examined, they confirm the conclusion that among the new parochial clergy there was a distinct and prominent laxity of life."⁵

The majority of the clergy, it may be added, were a byword for ignorance. Not allowed, or unable to preach, they were contemptuously dubbed "dumb dogs." And this low standard of learning prevailed not merely in the early years of Elizabeth, when to fill the vacancies all sorts and conditions of men, "unmeet persons" were admitted to the ministry, but far into the reign and in the case of many even to the very end of it, despite all the efforts made to raise the standard.⁶ It is not surprising then, that neither the Elizabethan

¹ Cf. 13 Elizabeth, c. 10.

² *Parish Life under Queen Elizabeth*, p. 30. Cf. also W. H. Frere, *A History of the English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I*, London, 1904, p. 191, and for a general survey Froude, *History of England*, Vol. VII, pp. 13 ff.

³ *Elizabethan Episcopal Administration*, Alcuin Club, 1924, Vol. I, pp. lxxxiv, and cxliv-cl.

⁴ F. O. White, *Lives of the Elizabethan Bishops*, London, 1898. Cf. also Frere, op. cit., pp. 156, 157.

⁵ *Parish Life under Queen Elizabeth*, p. 41. Cf. also his *Elizabethan Episcopal Administration*, Vol. I, pp. lxxxvii ff. and xc; Froude, op. cit. Vol. IX, p. 434.

⁶ Kennedy, *Parish Life under Queen Elizabeth*, 36-39, *Elizabethan Episcopal Administration*, Vol. I, pp. xcvi-ciii; F. Paget, *An Introduction to the Fifth Book of Hooker's Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, pp. 77 and 132; R. G. Usher, *The Reconstruction of the English Church*, London, 1910, pp. 95 and 207 ff. This latter historian assigns as a principal cause of this lack of learning the fact "that the crown and laity controlled the presentation to the majority of all the benefices, and holding such views as they did of the subservience of ecclesiastical to political interests, preferred to appoint men who, although ignorant, were safe politically, rather than to take the risk that the man with learning might become troublesome." In 1604

bishops nor the ministers were held in high esteem by the people, nor that the established church exercised little influence.¹

The Queen herself who despised a married clergy,² pillaged the Church wholesale, despite the protests of more than one of her bishops. At the very beginning of her reign she compelled the new bishops to exchange some of the lands belonging to their sees for the restoration of certain livings, tithes and the like which were of small value. "Very little attention," writes Professor Dietz, "has been paid by investigators to the significance of these transfers and exchanges, perhaps on the assumption of their unimportance. They seem to have involved vast properties, and the estates of the bishops acquired by Elizabeth became an element of really great importance in her revenues."³ Added to this, she kept sees vacant for years, enjoying meanwhile the temporalities, and at times delayed to hand over these temporalities even when a bishop had been appointed,⁴ and, as has already been stated, to satisfy her rapacious courtiers and councillors she compelled the bishops to surrender to them manors belonging to their sees, many of the leading laity benefiting in this way at the expense of the Church. The full history, indeed, of the Establishment under Elizabeth with its moral and intellectual decadence, its sycophantic servility and the long continued pillage of the Church would make a sorry tale. Allen, at all events, it is clear, was not merely beating the air when he made these charges.

In his next paragraph Allen attacks the Government for allowing so many undesirable aliens to settle in England. "She hath laid the country," he writes, "wide open to be a place of refuge and sanctuary of all atheists, Anabaptists, heretics and rebellious of all nations, and replenished sundry the coast towns and others with innumerable strangers of the worst sort of malefactors and sectaries to the great impoverishing of the inhabitants and no small peril the whole realm." Such an attack would certainly have found a sympathetic echo in many an Elizabethan Englishman. At various times during the reign the Government had permitted a considerable influx of foreigners, French, Dutch and Walloons for the most part. Colonies of them had been established in London, Southampton, Dover, Rye and Winchelsea as well as in Norwich, Yarmouth and other towns of the Eastern counties. Not all of these aliens were

one year after the death of Elizabeth five-sixths of all the benefices of the realm were controlled by the laity. (Ibid. p. 95, cf. also the tables, pp. 111 and 112.) The new religion, as was pointed out by the Catholic exiles was essentially a settlement by laymen who were not slow in profiting by it.

¹ Kennedy, *Parish Life*, p. 83; H. Hall, *Society in the Elizabethan Age*, 5th ed., pp. 104-106, 117 and 170. Cf. also Froude, *History*, Vol. VII, p. 18.

² Cf. the humiliating conditions for their marriage laid down by the Injunctions of 1559 *Cardwell Documentary Annals*, Vol. I, p. 192. Cf. also p. 273; *Parker Correspondence*, pp. 66, 148, 151 and 157.

³ F. C. Dietz, *Public Finance*, 1558-1641, London, 1932, p. 293. Cf. also p. 9.

⁴ For a list of the sees and of the number of years they were kept vacant, cf. W. P. M. Kennedy, *Elizabethan Episcopal Administration*, Vol. I, pp. xii and xiii.

desirable immigrants, for amongst them writes Strype "were Anabaptists also and sectaries, holding heretical and ill opinions, and some also suspected to be guilty of horrible crimes as of rebellions, murders and robberies. And all took shelter here under the pretence that they might have the free exercise of the Christian religion according to the profession and practice thereof in this realm. This gave occasion to many to reproach the Government as though it were an harbour to all sorts of sectaries. And indeed, several opinions and doctrines sprung from some of those foreigners, began now, if not before, to be dispersed in the nation, dangerous to the established religion and the civil government."¹ Such exiled saints, as Froude ironically terms them, the Bishop of London described as a marvellous colluvies of evil persons, for the most part facinorosi, ebriosi et sectarii.²

The authorities, however, while offering a hospitable welcome to the industrious aliens who introduced into the country new manufactures, were quite alive to the presence among them of many undesirables, chiefly Anabaptists, and ordered enquiries to be made for such in 1560, again a few years later and a third time in 1568, but despite the proclamation of 1560 it is not clear that any effective measures were taken to expel them.³ At times, however, the Government proceeded to extreme severity and Stow records that in 1575 eleven Dutch Anabaptists, some of them women, were put to death at Smithfield.⁴

In London and some of the provincial towns, quite apart from their religious beliefs, industrious aliens, who were profitable to the country, incurred at times hostile protests and opposition from the native inhabitants on the ground that they engaged in retail business, were underselling them and taking trade from them or that they practised their calling solely to enrich themselves and did not plant the new industries among Englishmen.⁵ Opposition to these immigrants appears, indeed, to have been perennial in London; and in 1586 the apprentices of the city raised a riot against the Dutch and French aliens, which, however, was suppressed without difficulty.⁶ Allen on the whole seems to have been well informed.

¹ Strype, *Annals*, I, II, p. 271.

² Froude, *History*, Vol. VII, p. 17.

³ Cf. W. Cunningham, *Alien Immigrants to England*, London, 1897, pp. 149 ff. For the proclamation of 22nd September, 1560, cf. Strype, *Life of Grindal*, p. 181. For the articles of enquiry of 1567 and the measure of 1568 cf. Strype, *Life of Parker*, Vol. I, p. 521, and Grindal's *Remains*, pp. 296 ff.

⁴ *Annals*, p. 679. For the proceedings against the Norwich Anabaptists, cf. J. S. Burn, *The History of the French, Wallon, Dutch and Other Foreign Protestant Refugees in England*. London, 1846, p. 64. The growing concern of the Government as regards aliens is shown in the Privy Council Registers, particularly in Vols. VIII, XIX and XXI.

⁵ Cf. Cunningham, op. cit. pp. 138 and 139; J. S. Burn, op. cit. pp. 48, 64 and 191, and E. Lipson, *The Economic History of England*, 5th ed., 1929, pp. 435-438.

⁶ Cf. Cunningham, op. cit. pp. 165 ff; J. S. Burn, op. cit. p. 10. For the protest of 1571, cf. R. H. Tawney and E. Power, *Tudor Economic Documents*, London, 1924, Vol. I, pp. 308-309. For later protests cf. E. P. Cheyney, *A History of England from the Defeat of the Armada*, London, 1924, Vol. II, p. 256.

After his comments on the harbouring of strangers, he proceeds to attack the fiscal demands of Elizabeth's government. "She hath not spared", he writes, "to oppress her subjects (never having just wars with any king or country in the world) with manifold exactions not only by ordinary means of more frequent and large subsidies (for which only end she hath had more parliaments and more often prorogations thereof than ever any lawful prince in so many years), but also by sundry shameful guiles of lotteries, laws, decrees and falls of money and such like deceits : and hath employed the riches of the realm to set up and sustain rebels and heretics against their natural princes, to the great dishonour of our nation, damage of our merchants, as well of all other travellers ; a public piracy and robbery both by sea and land, therewith authorising by her letters of marque and otherwise permitting divers wicked persons to spoil whom they list without sparing, some piece of the gain returning to some of her own chief councillors and officers." In the reign of Elizabeth the principle was still in force that the expenses of government should be defrayed by the ordinary revenue of the sovereign, and that only occasionally in times of exceptional strain, particularly when the country was at war, should additional grants be made by a Parliament summoned chiefly for that reason. This was the principle underlying Allen's indictment ; and his indictment is substantially correct. It has been asserted, it is true, that during the first part of the reign, the Queen seldom asked her subjects for extraordinary supplies¹ ; but this is demonstrably untrue. Despite the fact that the country for practically the whole of that period was not at war, subsidies with the accompanying tenths and fifteenths besides the contributions from the clergy, were granted in 1559, 1563, 1571, 1576, 1581, 1585 and 1587.² "It must not be overlooked" writes Professor Dietz, "that during the first period of her reign Elizabeth placed considerable reliance upon parliamentary subsidies and collected great sums from her subjects by virtue of these grants."³ The Government, indeed, as the same author points out, tried to depart from the time-honoured principle that subsidies were war measures ; and in 1566 suffered a tactical defeat "for the Parliament seems to have stumbled upon a device to prevent the execution of an unwilling grant by the simultaneous discussion of extremely delicate matters upon which the crown would consider debate objectionable."⁴ In fact Parliament had to be carefully managed to obtain these grants, chiefly by the suggested dangers of war, though the dangers, if at times genuine, were probably not so imminent as they were portrayed by the speakers for the Government.⁵

¹ Thorold Rogers, *A History of Agricultural Prices in England*, Vol. V, p. 150.

² C. F. Dietz, *English Public Finance, 1558-1641*, pp. 21-28, 44, 53 and 392 note 23 ; S. Dowell, *A History of Taxation and Taxes in England*, 1888 ed. Vol. Bk. II, c. i, Part II, Sect. III.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 74. Cf. also his *Excequeri n Elizabeth's Reign*, 1923, pp. 74-76.

⁵ Dietz, *Public Finance*, p. 24.

Had Allen been writing in 1603 instead of in 1588, his strictures as regards the weight of taxation might have been even more severe; for in the latter part of the reign the burden increased enormously, though there was then the excuse of war.¹ Added to this, the counter-measures of Spain, after the English Government had sided openly with the rebels in the Low-Countries, quickly caused disturbance in the trade of the country. Already by 1586 an industrial depression had resulted, which lasted, indeed, to the very end of the reign, and which only ended when peace was made.² The war, moreover, and the Irish troubles accompanying it, drained the treasury despite the use of every expedient to raise money, and at the death of Elizabeth her Government was bankrupt.³ It was no wonder that Burghley, who saw the consequences of war, was on the side of peace.

What Allen intended by his reference to "laws and decrees" is by no means clear. Possibly he had in mind monopolies, particularly those in the form of licences relaxing the rigidity of the law. The power to grant such when conferred on an individual afforded opportunities for extortion and led to grave abuses. Nor is the meaning of "falls of money" clear.⁴ If by it he meant the depreciation in the value of money, he would be right in fact, but wrong in blaming the Government; for that depreciation was due in the main to the influx of gold and silver into Europe from the Spanish dominions in the West. As for lotteries, there seems to have been but one throughout the reign, that organised in 1568 for the repair of the harbours.⁵

His assertion that the Government had employed the wealth of the country in supporting rebels and heretics needs no comment, as the fact that it did so in Scotland, France and the Low-Countries is beyond dispute. It was for this reason among others that the tortuous and machiavellian policy of the Government, which is not to be identified with the English people,⁶ was viewed by many in Europe

¹ Cf. W. R. Scott, *The Constitution and Finance of English, Scotch and Irish Joint-Stock Companies* Cambridge, 1910-1912, Vol. I, p. 93. Cf. also Dietz, *Public Finance*, pp. 49 ff, 389, note 17 and 392, note 23.

² Cf. E. Lipson, *The Economic History of England*, Vol. II, pp. 303-305; W. R. Scott, op. cit., Vol. I, c. IV, pp. 93 ff.; J. S. Corbett, *The Successors of Drake*, 1919 ed. C. IV, pp. 154 ff. 231, 361-365, and 403-406.

³ Dietz, *Public Finance*, c. IV *The Bankruptcy of the Tudor State*. Cf. also E. P. Cheyney, *A History of England*, Vol. II, p. 570.

⁴ E. Lipson, op. cit. Vol. III, p. 354. Cf. also W. R. Scott, op. cit. Vol. I, p. 53.

⁵ Dietz, *Public Finance*, p. 28.

⁶ A fundamental defect of many historians of Elizabethan history is the identification of the Government with the people or nation. The following passage of the late Professor McNeill merits consideration. "I rejoice," he writes, "in the opportunity of protesting against a cardinal error in history and a mischievous error in effect—to represent civilisation as a political thing, or having a political foundation. Throughout history, the kingdom of this world, the realm of statecraft and politics, have been the devil's playground, swept and garnished for him by the ambition of statesmen and politicians, to have a part in something that is supreme and absolute, a thing which has a code of ethics all its own. I would ask my readers to think and think again over what is implied in Nicholas Murray Butler's phrase 'the fundamental difference between the Nation and the State.' Nationality is

in much the same light as was the régime of Nazi-Socialism before the second world-war and as the Soviet system is by its opponents at the present day. England, that is to say her Government, and not Philip II, was the aggressor, and was considered not without reason as the disturber of the whole world.¹ A further reason for this ill-fame mentioned by Allen is to be found in the exploits of the English buccaneers. Piracy, no doubt, was a general characteristic of the age and was not confined to one country; but England certainly held an invidious primacy in this respect and gained the reputation of being a nation of pirates.² Many of the Queen's councillors and courtiers participated in the spoils: it was one phase of the pursuit of wealth irrespective of moral principles that characterised those in high positions. Burghley, however, looked askance at it,³ one reason being his fear of embroiling the country in an open breach with Spain.⁴ The Queen herself took shares in these practical raids, as she did in Hawkins slave-trade, and, indeed, by means of the booty received from them was able to pay her debts.⁵ In this she was as utterly devoid of moral scruple as she was in issuing letters of marque, which, if occasion demanded, she could disown.⁶

Allen next attacks the selling of licences, dispensations, pardons and the like for money and bribes, enriching thereby not only the queen herself, but her "courtiers and other lost cousins and companions whom her excessive avarice will not suffer to reward of her own," and who thus "feed upon the carcase of the Commonwealth: yea even suck the very blood of poor afflicted Catholic men's consciences who besides those sacrilegious mass mulcts and the

to be distinguished from nationalism, which is a political doctrine, meaning localised statism; it is a fact not a theory; a nation is a species of the genus civilisation: a state is a species of the genus government. Nationality is the type of civilisation which a people has developed which has become that people's tradition and is distinctive of that people. Nationalities, as such, do not hate each other, do not fear or suspect each other, do not war upon each other, do not circumvent each other, do not spy upon each other: these being the privileges of statecraft. Neither Europe nor the world suffers any detriment from the diversity of national civilisations. On the contrary, uniformity, if it were possible, would be calamitous." *Early Irish Laws and Institutions*, p. 53. The Catholic exiles, it may be remarked, always in their writings distinguished the nation from the government.

¹ Cf. E. P. Cheyney, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 448. *Spanish Calendar*, 1558-1567, p. 230. *Foreign Calendar*, 1558-1575, pp. lxxiv-lxxv and xc. Underlying much of the policy of the Elizabethan Government and of the defence of it by its modern apologists, is the principle that the end justifies the means, a principal that has not been inoperative in recent world affairs.

² Cf. E. P. Cheyney, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 426 ff. and 463 ff.: J. S. Corbett, *Drake and the Tudor Navy*, Vol. I, pp. 71, 153 and 156; W. R. Scott, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 72; Dasent, *Privy Council Registers*, Vol. I, pp. xvii, xix, xx and xxx; W. S. Holdsworth, *History of English Law*, Vol. IV, p. 4.

³ C. Read, *Mr. Secretary Walsingham*, Vol. II, p. 57; Cheyney, op. cit., pp. 502-505 and 517.

⁴ Cheyney, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 428; C. Read, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 85; J. S. Corbett, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 218-219.

⁵ W. R. Scott, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 74 and 89, Vol. II, p. 5; J. S. Corbett, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 337; A. F. Pollard, *Political History of England*, p. 313.

⁶ W. R. Scott, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 72 and 74. From a purely economic point of view these practices were prejudicial in the long run to English commerce, as they hindered the growth of legitimate trade even as Hawkins' slave trade did in Africa. *Ibid.*, Vol. I pp. 42 and 82-89. Cf. also E. Lipson, *Economic History of England*, Vol. II, p. 365.

new made spoils and intolerable extortions for not coming to their damnable idolatry of the communion (which for the love of God's law they often incur and sustain, to the utter lamentable ruin of them and their posterity) be fain by great importable gifts to procure at her officers' hands some little ease and release of the intolerable fears and miseries that they live in. By which wicked traffic and other pitiful pillage of the people, some of her creatures are grown so great and insolent, that all states and degrees within the realm stand in awe and danger of them."

Here, in the first place, Allen seems to be referring to the grant to courtiers and others of various kinds of monopolies, which increased exorbitantly in this reign and led to grave abuses. "Increase in prices, interference with individual liberty, intrusion into private affairs, arrogance of possessors of monopolies and their agents and inability to sue in the ordinary courts naturally brought about resistance to the existence of favoured individuals possessing monopolies of the purchase or sale or importation or exportation or manufacture of some kind of familiar goods."¹ As such grants were considered part of the royal prerogative, no action against them was possible by the ordinary process of law; and after the failure of one or two attempts at private resistance to particular instances of these abuses, resentment became vocal and a vigorous protest against the practice was made in the last parliament of the reign.

Allen's mention in the passage quoted of the afflictions of Catholics refers probably to such recusants as did not pay the fine of £20 per lunar month for not attending the Protestant service; for in an earlier passage he has already spoken of these fines. Such recusants who did not pay the fine were liable by statute to forfeit their goods and to be deprived of two-thirds of their lands. "As the arrangement was worked, the informer who secured an indictment and conviction of a recusant was given a commission to find his land and to lease two-thirds at a rent for her Majesty. The informer then offered composition to the recusant, and when this was agreed upon and paid, the informer arranged with some trustee of the recusant to lease the land to the recusant at a low rate during pleasure. In this way recusants had to pay grievous fines to informers, pay a certain rent for their own lands to the queen and lose their moveables."²

Of those who by these practices were grown so great that all states and degrees feared them, Allen singles out the Earl of Leicester, and proceeds to mention some of the crimes of which popular report and the author or authors of "*Leicester's Commonwealth*" regarded him as guilty. That *chronique scandaleuse*, which was really put together for a political purpose, no doubt contains many libels about

¹ Cheyney, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 291. His is the best general account of monopolies in so far as they concern the reign of Elizabeth. Cf. also E. Lipson, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, pp. 352 ff.

² Dietz, *Public Finance*, p. 87, note 4.

the Earl. As Professor Pollard remarks, "exhaustive research into the seamy side of Elizabethan diplomacy would probably reveal some foundation for many of its charges."¹ Be that as it may, enough is known of the historic Leicester to reveal him as a quite unscrupulous self-seeker apart from his singular incompetence.

The mention of the Earl and his association with Elizabeth leads Allen in the next place to speak in very vigorous and unvarnished terms of the Queen's immorality and of the depravity of her court, which, he declares, she has made "a trap by this damnable and detestable art to entangle in sin and overthrow the younger sort of the nobility and gentlemen of the land."² He dilates, then, on the number of persons, English and foreign, whom she has led on in the hope of marriage yet in the end has always cheated of their hope; and this in spite of supplication by principal peers and others of high authority that she should marry and procure lawful issue to inherit her dominions. "By all which dishonourable and unworthy dealing," Allen continues, "the whole world may see that in atheism and epicurism she would (if it were possible and might be suffered as she hath begun) turn the life and whole weal of our country, once most flourishing, to the feeding of her own disordered delights, being loath, no doubt, that anything should be left after her life, that her rage and riot had not overrun, or that her realm should be extant any longer than she might make pleasure of it, most glad (as may seem), that so flourishing and ancient a commonwealth, which she hath in manner brought to destruction in her life, might be buried in her ignominious ashes, when she is dead.

"Besides all these outrages in her person and regiment, and besides sundry wicked attempts and treasons before she came to the crown against her prince and country at home she hath showed such faithless dealing towards all near neighbours, most just, mighty and Catholic kings abroad, that it is almost incredible." She is known to be "the first and principal fomenter of all the furious rebellions in Scotland, France and Flanders," for which purpose she hath "sent abroad exceeding great number of intelligencers, spies and practisers into most commonwealths of Christendom." But more than this, "she hath by messengers and letters dealt with the cruel and dreadful tyrant and enemy of our Faith, the Great Turk himself (against whom our noble kings have in old times so valiantly fought and vowed themselves to all perils and peregrinations) for the invasion of some parts and places of Christendom, and interception of some defensible ports and places of the same, as for the disturbance of Christianity and annoyance of the principal defenders of the Catholic religion, she hath at this day a ledger (ambassador) in his court."³

¹ *Political History*, p. 374.

² The evidence as regards Elizabeth, which runs throughout the reign and comes not merely from hostile sources, suggests that her case was a pathological one.

³ Cf. *Venetian Calendar*, 1581-1591, pp. xxix-lvi; *English Historical Review*, July, 1593, pp. 439 ff.; and C. Read, *Mr. Secretary Walsingham*, Vol. III, pp. 225-230 and 326-332.

"By which Machiavellian, godless and conscienceless course unjust, usurped regiments be always conducted; advanced not by counsel or courage, but by plain trumpery, treason and cosinage, working their own peace, wealth and felicity by their neighbours wars, woe and misery."

Her obstinacy, however, "and satanical obduration daily increasing, she hath these late years imbrued her hands and country with the sacred blood of a number of most innocent, learned and famous religious men, yea and holy bishops also as well in England as Ireland, caused them pitifully to be racked, rent, chained, famished beaten buffeted derided abused, and by false accusation of crimes never intended, under pretence of treason against her usurped state and person, to be finally with all cruelty executed to the regret and shame of our nation and wonder of all the world. And finally to accomplish the measure of all her inhuman cruelty she hath this last year barbarously, unnaturally against the law of nations, by a statute of riot and conspiracy, murdered the Lady Mary of famous memory, Queen of Scotland, dowager of France and God's anointed, her next kinswoman, and by law and right the true owner of the crown of England."

By all such crimes she has merited deposition: "none ever, not amongst the heathen, so unprofitable, so evil, so faithless so pernicious; no realm ever so far fallen from religion, public honesty, order and sincerity as ours hath done in her unhappy usurped government."

This ends Allen's criticism of the Elizabethan régime. The rest of the booklet is taken up with the question of excommunication and deposition, illustrating these topics by examples from the Old and New Testament as well as from the past history of Christendom. He concludes with an exhortation to take courage and help "the accomplishment of that which all true Christian and godly English hearts do desire."

Such, then, was Allen's estimation of Elizabeth and her government: and it is interesting to recall that shortly before the second world-war a writer in *The Times*, describing in five leading articles the régime of Nazi-Socialism, came to see strong resemblances between that system and the government of Elizabeth. It was a shrewd judgment. The gestapo, numerous spies at work both at home and abroad; faked evidence at trials, encouragement and secret help to dissatisfied minorities in other countries, the lack of moral principle, the lying propaganda and utter disregard of truth and the use of appalling torture, these and like features of the system can be found also in the Elizabethan régime. It was, in fact, one of the worst tyrannies that this country has ever suffered. It was this that Allen and the Catholic exiles realised.

L. HICKS.

LOST OASES—II

THE Mordaunts had acquired Turvey Park in Bedfordshire by the thirteenth century and held it until 1787; but the family seems to have made Drayton House, Co. Northants, which it acquired by marriage in the sixteenth century, its principal home until the death of the 2nd Earl of Peterborough in 1697, when Drayton passed to his daughter, whereas the heir male inherited Turvey. The house was pulled down before the end of the eighteenth century and its materials used to build a farm-house on its site, known as Old Hall Farm.

The 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th Lords Mordaunt, who were in possession from 1504 to 1609, were all Catholics, though the 3rd Lord appears to have wavered about 1585 or so (see the account of Drayton House which follows).

The 4th Lord left Drayton to his son, but Turvey to his widow, Margaret Compton, for her life. She was a daughter of the Catholic 1st Lord Compton of Compton Wynyates, Co. Warwick, and was so well known to the Government as a recusant that it took her fatherless son away from her in order to have him brought up a Protestant by the Rev. George Abbot, later Archbishop of Canterbury. And well it might, for during her long tenure of Turvey it continued to be, as it had been all through the reign of Elizabeth, a Catholic stronghold.

Thus Bishop Richard Smith, who arrived in England as Vicar Apostolic in late April, 1625, and left England August 24th, 1631, "lived ordinarily in the house of Lady Mordaunt, widow, . . . at Turvey in Bedfordshire, the house in the midst of a park", whence "he travelleth in his coach with four horses accompanied with nine or ten priests". (Parliamentary History. 1807, Debates 1628.)

She was still living at Turvey, a papist, in 1654, and in the next year her daughters, Elizabeth, Margaret and Anne, paid £216 for recusancy by the hand of John Manley, gentleman.

On her death, which perhaps took place in this interval, Turvey reverted to her grandson, the 6th Lord Mordaunt and 2nd Earl of Peterborough, who had been brought up a Protestant by his apostate father, and the first chapter of its Catholic history closes.

The second opened with the conversion of the 2nd Earl in March, 1686-7. About Christmas, 1687, he took his nephew away from Eton and, at Easter of the following year, sent him to the Jesuit School in the Savoy Palace. (Report of a Committee called to enquire "What children are sent abroad to be educated in the Popish Religion", presented to the House of Commons July 5th, 1689.)

On October 28th, 1689, it was resolved by the House of Commons that he should be impeached for becoming a Catholic, but the case was dropped and he was released from the Tower on bail, October 7th, 1690, having been there since December 24th, 1688.

There is no means of knowing whether, when he was asked by

the churchwardens of St. Margaret's, Westminster (Peterborough House, Milbank, was in the parish), if they might dispose of his pew as he had become a Catholic and replied "No, no; one doth not know what may happen" (Scott Gatty: *Mary Davies and the Manor of Ebury*, i. 190, citing Lord Ailesbury's *Memoirs*) he was pulling their legs, or wavering in conviction, or anticipating the return of St. Margaret's to its original purposes. He seems to have lived principally at Drayton where, and not at Turvey, Bishop John Leyburn stayed with him in July, 1687, and was confirmed in the chapel which was pillaged by the anti-Catholic mob in December, 1688.

He died in 1697, leaving no son, and Turvey, though not Drayton, passed to the Protestant son of his Protestant brother, so that the Catholic life of Turvey Park again came to an end.

It is probable that it witnessed a fleeting rebirth with the 3rd Earl's second marriage to Anastasia Robinson about 1722—he married her secretly and did not acknowledge her until a few months before his death in 1735—for she was certainly a Catholic and maintained a chapel in her house (Burton, *Life and Times of Bishop Challoner*, i. 203, 204). It is not known, however, whether this chapel keeping occurred in her widowhood, which lasted twenty years to 1755 and was passed in a house in London¹ where she was a friend of the poet, Pope, and a well-known figure in literary circles.

But it is certain that a Catholic group continued to survive at Turvey after she left it on her husband's death in 1735; for on September 6th, 1742, Bishop Challoner found no less than 25 persons to confirm at Turvey and a total congregation of 35 (Burton, *Life and Times of Bishop Challoner*, i. 148).

It is known, from the Weston Underwood Catholic register, that the chaplain at the Throckmorton's home at Weston Underwood, which is only 5 miles from Turvey, had taken charge of the Turvey Catholics as early as 1714 (Payne, *Old English Catholic Missions*, 85). But the presence of the Catholic Countess cannot fail to have been an encouragement to the dwindling group, whose other rallying point was the Brand family which survived in Turvey till about the middle of the eighteenth century.

Did Lady Peterborough's influence cease with her death in 1755? It is curious that a secular priest of her name should be found at the only place in the whole of Bedfordshire which is known to have sheltered a Catholic priest in the eighteenth century.²

The village of Shefford lies some 16 miles to the ESE. of Turvey and here as early as 1728 a priest, whose name is unknown, was living

¹ Or did her husband leave her his house at Parsons Green "where his conversation and his cookery, his music and his wall fruit delighted the artistic and literary society of Queen Anne and the early Georges"?

² It is just possible that CHAUSON also sheltered a priest at some period in the eighteenth century. See Burton, *Life and Times of Bishop Challoner*, i. 204, where he has misread Challoner's MS., printed opposite page 148, making CHANSON of CHAUSON. There is no such place as CHANSON in the county, nor for that matter is there a CHAUSON, but there is a CHAWSTON, north of Roxton, where a recusant family called Hunt was living as late as 1719."

in the house in the High Street of a butcher called William Noddings. By about 1760 the priest was Stephen Robinson and he continued to live in Shefford until his burial at Campton, $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles away, on February 12th, 1781.

Was Stephen Robinson a relation of the Countess and had she contrived to settle him with William Noddings, who died in 1743? If she did, she planted better than she knew, for the Shefford mission still flourishes and is the only Catholic centre in the county which can trace its origin to the eighteenth century or, for that matter, to the first half of the nineteenth.

The Catholic history of Drayton House, in the parish of Lowick in Northamptonshire, a beautiful place which embodies buildings of every century from the fourteenth to the eighteenth, covers two periods: from at least as early as the fifteenth century (before the end of which the existing chapel was built) until about 1625, and again from March, 1687, to June, 1697.

When Queen Elizabeth set on foot her religious changes in 1559 the owner was the 1st Lord Mordaunt who had married its heiress and who survived until 1562. He was certainly a Catholic and "lost favour after the Reformation" (*Complete Peerage*) on that account. The 2nd, 3rd and 4th Lord Mordaunts were all Catholics. A sister of the 2nd Lord became a nun. The 3rd Lord would appear to have temporised for a time, for he is said to have been confirmed in the Faith by 1588 (*Mathew's Catholicism in England*, 48).

It was no doubt during the ownership of one of these that a priest's hiding hole, which still exists, was provided. It is nearly square, being 10 feet by $9\frac{1}{2}$ feet, but only $4\frac{1}{2}$ feet high. It is entered by raising boards in the floor of a small closet on the first floor, which leads out of the principal bedroom in the Elizabethan wing.

The 4th Lord employed Robert Keyes, the Gunpowder Plot conspirator, as "the Keeper of his house at Turvey" in Bedfordshire, which had been the family home from at least as early as the thirteenth century and was not parted with until the eighteenth, and his wife as governess. This can only mean that he wanted a Catholic to superintend the religious education of his daughters (*Trial of Guy Fawkes*, 19: Sir Edward Hoby to the English Ambassador at Brussels) who, as we have seen, paid large sums for recusancy as late as 1655.

The connection of the 4th Lord with the Keyes family was not his only offence in the eyes of the Government in connection with the Powder Plot, since in November, 1605, it saw fit to lodge him in the Tower of London from which he was not released till June 3rd, 1606, after being fined to the extent of 10,000 marks.

His wife, whom he chose from the then staunchly recusant family of Compton of Compton Wynyates, Co. Warwick, now represented by the Marquis of Northampton, continued in her recusant courses long after her husband's death in 1609. Indeed it was she who provided Bishop Richard Smith with his usual residence, when he was not in London, from April, 1625, until August 24th, 1631 (Parliamentary

History. 1807. Debates, 1628. Cited in Foley Records, S.J., i, 138). This, though, was not at Drayton, which passed to her son, the 5th Lord, but at Turvey which was left to her for her widowhood.

The 5th Lord Mordaunt came into Drayton at the age of 10. He consequently fell in ward to the King, who took him away from his Catholic mother and handed him over to the Rev. George Abbot who very shortly afterwards became Archbishop of Canterbury. The object of this arrangement, which was no uncommon one—the young Lord Dormer suffered a similar fate at almost exactly the same time, and other instances could be adduced—was admittedly to de-Catholicise influential families.

It did not, however, succeed at once in the case of the 5th Lord Mordaunt, as is shown by two incidents, the one in 1616 and the other in 1625. On July 1st, 1616, the secular priest Thomas Maxfield was martyred at Tyburn. A MS. by a Catholic writer relates how, among those present, "besides many illustrious Knights and nobles, are to be mentioned the Right Honourable barons, Lords Mordaunt and Compton, two fine young men, also of Spaniards not a few. . . . There are also present a multitude of Catholics of either sex. . . ." (*Downside Review*, XXXIV. 42.)

I doubt if the writer would have gone out of the way to describe Lord Mordaunt and Lord Compton as "two fine young men" if they had not been Catholics. I do not consider that the sentence "There are also present a multitude of Catholics of either sex" implies that those described before it were necessarily Protestant, since the Spaniards clearly were not. Lord Compton, who was Lord Mordaunt's brother-in-law, was the son of a known Catholic and there is no evidence that he abandoned his ancestral faith before his elevation to the Earldom of Northampton in 1618. The second episode, in 1625, supports my contention that Lord Mordaunt was a Catholic at the time of Maxfield's martyrdom. It is related in the *Life of Archbishop James Ussher*, by Richard Parr, pp. 26, 27, published in 1686, and is as follows.

In November, 1625, Lord Mordaunt, who had in 1621 broken with the example of his father, grandfather and great-grandfather, in marrying a lady who was not only a Protestant but a republican, invited James Ussher, who though Archbishop of Armagh spent the years 1623 to 1626 in England, to come and stay at Drayton.

The Rev. Richard Parr, D.D., was the Archbishop's chaplain. He prints in his book a MS. note in the Archbishop's handwriting which he had presumably found among his papers. It reads "In November, 1625, he was invited by the Lord Mordaunt and his lady to my Lord's house at Drayton in Northamptonshire, to confer with a priest he then kept, by the name of Beaumont¹ upon the points

¹ The identification of this priest presents grave difficulties. The *Dictionary of National Biography* in its article on Ussher makes him out to be Oswald Tesimond al. Philip Beaumont, S.J. But he was in Naples in 1610 and died there in 1635, and there is no other independent evidence of his being in England within that period; and it is perhaps improbable that

in dispute between the Church of Rome and ours : and particularly that the religion maintained by public authority in the Church of England was no new religion, but the same that was taught by Our Saviour and His Apostles and ever continueth in the primitive Church during the present times ”.

Parr then continues in his own words, “ What was the issue of this dispute, we must take from the report of my Lord and Lady and other persons of quality there present ; that this conference held for some days, and at last ended, with that satisfaction to them both and confusion of his adversary, that as it confirmed the lady in her religion (whom her Lord, by the means of this priest, endeavoured to pervert) so it made his Lordship so firm a convert to the Protestant religion that he lived and died in it ”.

It is clear that until the fateful contest Lord Mordaunt was a Catholic. With his defection the first period in the Catholic life of Drayton drew to its close. His defection was quickly rewarded by the Earldom of Peterborough in 1628. His eldest son, who was born in 1623, was consequently brought up a Protestant. He did not, however, share his father's Parliamentary views in the Civil War and fought on the Royalist side. The Restoration, therefore, found him *persona grata* at Court and he was employed by James II in connection with his marriage to Mary of Modena in 1673.

In March, 1686-7 the 6th, and the first Protestant, Lord Mordaunt became a Catholic. Thus it happened that Bishop John Leyburn was able to include Drayton in the course of his visitation in the summer of that year, and to confirm in the Drayton Chapel (Maziere Brady, *Annals of the Catholic Hierarchy*, 143) ; and thus it befell that the anti-Catholic mob from the neighbourhood pillaged the chapel in December, 1688 (*News Letter* of 30th December, 1688).

Thus, too, there hangs in Drayton House to this day a portrait in oils of John (Denys) Hudleston, O.S.B., who received Charles II into the Church on his deathbed and was chaplain to his widow at Somerset House from about 1669 till she left England in March, 1692. The convert Earl no doubt made his acquaintance at Court in the reign of James II, and may well have had him down to stay at Drayton since he did not die till 1698, one year after the Earl, with whose death the Catholic story of Drayton ends.

As his last illness closed in upon him Lord Mordaunt turned to the physician, Nathaniel Johnston, who was staying in the house in November, 1696, and whose brother, Henry, was a Benedictine monk in London. Perhaps while the one cared for his body the other cared for his soul.

T. B. TRAPPES-LOMAX.

his superiors would have sent him for a second missionary tour of duty to this country since he had become obnoxious to the Government when, during his first stay, he became implicated in the Gunpowder Plot. All this does not disprove the identification though it makes it hazardous. Very curiously the author, by name Reilly, of a book called *Historical Anecdotes*, p. 51, which was published in 1835, calls him “ the Jesuit Rookwood ”. A Robert Rookwood, S.J., died in England after 1632.

ITALIAN SANCTITY

III—A NURSE OF SAINTS : NORTH ITALY

THE Decree on the heroicity of the virtues of Antonio Maria Gianelli, bishop of Bobbio (b. Easter Sunday ; April 12th, 1789 ; d. Trinity Sunday, June 7th, 1846),¹ emphasises two points. 'Virtues' must not be studied *in vacuo*, but with exact attention to period, place, temperament—to 'nature,' in short, which Grace in no way ousts, but makes perfect : and Benedict XV quotes not only St. Thomas, but Dante—if but men would attend to 'the foundation laid by nature,' we should have a people that was good. Secondly, Heroicity consists, not in the extraordinary, but in the perfect fulfilment of the duties of one's state of life. We remember this, if we find the life of Gianelli—in one sense only—rather colourless. So we recall that he was born literally along with the French Revolution—ill-fated parent of how many wars !—into a land where Jansenist rigorism and Liberalism (even among the clergy) flourished side by side, and where anti-clericalism raged hot and where politics excited that Latin passion for intrigue for which the English may be both too easy-going and too forthright.

Born in Liguria of peasant-parents, he preserved their robust piety with a bent towards severity which was mellowed by his destined devotion to St. Alphonsus (regarded by the Jansenisers as the model of laxity and almost as bad as the Jesuits). So poor were the Gianellis that the boy had to write his lessons by firelight only. He was sent to Genoa for further study ; his vocation to the priesthood was recognised, and such was his oratorical gift that he was licensed to preach even important sermons while still subdeacon. He was ordained priest in 1812, and in 1814 joined the Congregation of 'Suburban Missions' and at once displayed his talent for giving missions and retreats. He taught literature in various colleges and finally in the Genoa seminary where too he was nominated 'prefect of discipline'—a thorny position in the circumstances. But his vocation was undoubtedly pastoral. Indeed, his sermons were thought by some to be too little 'theoretic,' not 'classical' enough. He was at least saved by his 'heart' from that bitter-chill Jansenism to which for one moment he was tempted, and his goodness was infectious—he has been called a forerunner of 'Catholic Action,' the Apostolate of the Laity.

From 1826 to 1838 he served as arch-priest of Chiavari, on the Ligurian Riviera, the most important Ligurian city after Genoa and Spezia. He was received there with pomp and circumstance,

¹ Cf. *Acta S. Sedis*, 1920, p. 170. And *Il Beato A. M. Gianelli*, by Canon L. Sanguinetti ; Turin-Rome ; 1925 ; pp. xx, 571.

which made the extreme simplicity of his life the more impressive, just as his tendency to austere organisation made his tenderness, when it revealed itself, the more moving. Ecclesiastical authority could still exert itself unexpectedly—disregard of abstinence led him to obtain the closure of butchers' shops on all Fridays and Saturdays. But it was not this sort of thing—nor certainly his method in the confessional—but his indefatigable and incessant preaching and hard work in all departments that won him his nickname of the Iron Saint. As Vicar-General of the archdiocese, his work was intensified, especially as he had charge of the seminary; further, he founded the 'Missionary Priests of St. Alphonsus', intended for giving retreats and missions in parishes: he took constant part in this apostolate; unhappily, after his death and without his guidance, the Institute drooped and disappeared. On the other hand, he created a congregation of Sisters of Our Lady dell'Orto, a popular Madonna, which flourished: its work was normal—educational, and care for the sick and the poor. During the cholera plague of 1835, he displayed the utmost heroism and practical good sense; yet how far were these still from modern times!

He walked barefoot in constant processions, rope round neck, wearing a crown of thorns and caused all his Canons to walk similarly crowned. The feuds of noble families were almost medieval: parochial feuds might end in battles about frontiers and Corpus Christi processions were interrupted. There were incredible disputes between Religious and the Arch-priest and Canons about 'privileges.' Worst was a calumny—repeated throughout years—that Gianelli taught that names of accomplices in sin must be revealed in the confessional.

In 1837, just as he hoped to resign his office and devote himself to missions, he was made bishop of Bobbio, where he developed a warm affection for the fiery St. Columbanus, founder of the famous monastery there: he exhumed and 'verified' his relics and wished to be buried near him. But he left, in retrospect, a very penetrating account of the good and bad in the Chiavari population and of his methods of getting to know every single parishioner by blessing their houses personally. At Bobbio he increased his austerity of life while preserving freedom of spirit amid his many rules. But his first task was to reform the clergy—their 'lack of learning, zeal and discipline': The archdiocese was asleep, sound asleep (*si dormiva di grosso*). It was natural, and necessary, to begin with the seminary—once, the seminarians, disgusted with their food, went on strike and marched out singing *In exitu Israel* . . . ! The whole of the studies had to be reorganised; the whole spirit changed. The regional bishops had not met since 1757 and then their decisions had not been promulgated: the synod of 1729 was regarded as having lapsed. Hence archi-diocesan all-but chaos. His work was bound to be detailed and intensive but monotonous. I may mention his creation of the

'Oblates of St. Alphonsus', destined to form the younger clergy : Jansenist infiltrations were to sap it interiorly : one priest apostatised, became a fierce anti-clerical, but repented. The new institute perished ; but the Bishop never ceased his own exhausting labours. Gianelli, insisted Benedict XV, "did but what he ought to do"—but in what circumstances ! We see now the point of those reminders—to study a Saint in his setting ; and, that heroicity consists in the perfect fulfilment of one's duty. He died after no long illness, June 7th, 1846, having failed in many immediate things, but having played a noble part in the tradition of Apostolate. He was not alone, but outstanding among the Confessors and indeed the Martyrs of that tragic period.

Giuseppe Cafasso (Canonised, June, 1947), was born on January 15th, 1811, at Castelnovo d'Asti, a territory rich in holy personages (St. John Baptist Rossi ; St. John Bosco, and many others) : his parents owned a small property and were model Christians. And so 'holy' was the small boy that when it was rumoured that Our Lady had appeared not far off, it was considered that if *he* saw the vision it could be believed in. He was taken there, saw nothing, and thereby extinguished the report. . . . We might be intimidated on hearing that he preached to and catechised other children ; but Don Bosco himself—his junior by 4 years—recalled how the boy was very small, but 'his body was all in his voice' : all asked what this child would be ? He was sent to school at Chieri and here he was rather bullied—one shoulder was higher than the other, and they mocked at him ; but a meeting with the 12-year-old Bosco made up for it—indeed, it was Bosco who suggested showing the young cleric some of the fun of a *festa*, saying there was a time for everything—time for church, time for fun. . . . Giuseppe laughed and eluded him. . . . On September 21st, 1833, more than a year before his time, he was ordained priest. Feeling the need for further study, he went to Turin, and after some disappointments due to the Jansenist tinge surviving in the University there, he joined a 'Convitto', a students' Hall where St. Alphonso's doctrine was taught. Here he spent three years ; already a halo of holiness seemed to surround the young priest in proportion as his physical malformation grew worse. He was then appointed tutor in Moral Theology, a post which he held for seven years : he was then (1843-4) appointed professor.

He had been noticeable, in his personal life, for his extreme modesty and recollection ; as tutor, for his lucidity, 'communicativeness', and practical good sense when faced with a moral problem. He began by expounding the more rigid doctrine ; then, softened it by Liguorian principles. His lecture-room was packed, even by externs, who climbed on one another's shoulders when the room was full. And his classes became not only schoolroom affairs, but a real educa-

tion in the priestly and ascetic life. His sermons were as simple and as consoling as possible. He said to Don Bosco: "Jesus, the Infinite Wisdom, used words and phrases common to those to whom He was speaking. Do the same!" And he told him to preach so that his mother could understand. John Bosco would read his script to her, she would remark: "I don't understand one word—not one word!" He would then put it into dialect. "If you can't preach better than that, go and talk to the goats!" When she 'began to understand', he would at last dare to present his script to Cafasso. Jansenism had passed from France to Tuscany, and Piedmont, between the two, was exposed to grave danger, and it is interesting that John Bosco, to tease his friend, would argue on behalf of the 'small number of the saved'. This went as near to irritating Cafasso as was possible! With Jansenism had come 'Regalism', the belief in the supremacy of the Prince even in spiritual things; the apostate priest Gioberti, in his *Gesuita moderno* (1847) has an astounding page of vitriolic invective directed against the very *Convitto* where Cafasso was. He, however, abstained wholly from politics, save that he openly professed his absolute allegiance to the Sovereign Pontiff. Such was his personal ascendancy that when someone said that all priests should be burnt save Don Cafasso, it could be retorted that he was just the one who *should* be burnt. . . . Yet the time was to come when his fellow-citizens wished to nominate him as their Member of Parliament.

Meanwhile, in 1848, he had been appointed Rector for the *Convitto*. He had nothing of the inquisitor about him; yet his intuition was such that Bosco himself called him *scrutator cordis*. He could, they said, 'see through a wall' . . . He could perceive, and state, a difficulty better than its victim could himself. A *glance* from him, said one, was more effective than any verbal reproach—as Our Lord's was for St. Peter.

Outside the *Convitto*, his primary work was to join in the regeneration of the clergy: contemporary writers, quoted by Salotti, show them as *either* at least in theory Jansenist rigorists, or, more usually, technically priests—they said Mass—but else, were haunters of cafés, gossipers, politicians, men of affairs, as worldly (out of human respect) as they dared be. There had been noble apostles of regeneration, not least Pio Lanteri, himself disciple of the convert Swiss Calvinist Diesbak, a strong anti-Febronianist; it was on the foundation laid by such men that Don Guala based the *Convitto*, and that Cafasso, Bosco, Cottolengo and so many others could build. If Cafasso insisted on the total *differentiation* between the ecclesiastical and the lay lives, so that we remember how even after the 1914-18 war many foreign Catholics *assumed* that a military chaplain, let alone a priest-soldier, could have gained nothing and *must* have lost much, we must recall that injurious form of 'mixing' mentioned just above. Not that Cafasso was a recluse. He seemed to be confessor to half

the province: he had a special grace for reconciling domestic or matrimonial difficulties: sensitive to the point, you might sometimes think, of prudery, he had an amazing influence over young men; he must have chuckled when a scurrilous priest, turned Protestant, but backed by freemason sindics and other atheists, came to lecture in the Castelnovo market-place, and all the small boys and girls of the town appeared with metal pots and pans on which they beat such a tattoo that the anti-clericals retired in angry disorder. Italians do not find noise distasteful . . . the children must have wished that the apostate should arrive on every Sunday. At the opposite extreme, important men—right up to a Minister of War—came to ask his clear, honest, always spiritual advice. Merely mentioning his special devotion to the Ignatian Exercises, I can but single out his incredibly courageous and loving work in prisons—atrocious sinks of squalor and vice despite the 'Enlightenment'—he was a true forerunner of their reform—"Cafasso is the first *galantuomo* in the world!", cried one scoundrel. . . . So indispensable seemed his presence at executions—still public—that he was nicknamed the 'gallows-priest' (*prete della forca*). A chapter of amazing episodes—some, dare I say, tragi-comic.¹

The intimacy between Don Cafasso and Don Bosco deserves an essay to itself. The former was throughout Bosco's guide: he dissuaded him from entering 'religion': he taught him in the *Convitto*: each was present at the other's First Mass. It was Don Bosco who took to Cafasso's retreat at Sant' Ignazio Giovanni Cagliero, leader of the first Salesian expedition to S. America, Vicar Apostolic of Patagonia from 1884, and finally Cardinal.

As death approached, Don Bosco saw that he was aware of it: every detail about the succession to his innumerable *enterprises* was regulated: his last month was harassed by absurd governmental suspicions that he and Bosco were involved in political intrigues—their houses and rooms were ransacked. On June 11th, 1860, he heard a number of confessions and then went to bed. Don Bosco assured him that he had ordered the young men to pray for him, but had said that Cafasso would be back to give them Benediction. "Don't be anxious," he answered. "Tell your lads that I will bless them all from heaven."

On June 23rd, 1860, as they pronounced the blessing for those in their agony, he sat up, stretched out his arms, smiled, lay back, and died. At his funeral, it was Don Bosco, so temperamentally different from him, yet linked with him by so incomparable a friendship, who spoke earth's last good-bye.²

Oreste Fontanella was born at Strona, near Biella, December 1st,

¹ One poor lad, desperate at dying in the full vigour of his youth, asked if he might jump a few times round the scaffold before mounting it. "These jumps," said the Saint, "won't keep him out of Paradise. . . ."

² *Il Beato Giuseppe Cafasso*, by Mgr. C. Salotti; Turin-Rome, 1925; pp. xii, 368.

1883, and was baptised next day. But his mother soon died, and in 1893 his father emigrated to Australia; Oreste remained with his grandparents who were bakers. His mother's death deeply impressed him: all his life he recited daily the 'orphan's prayer' to Our Lady: "one's mother never dies," he wrote, "especially ours, who are priests." In 1896, he entered the Biella seminary and we hear much of his gaiety and simplicity. In the holidays he went back to help in the shop, but such was the anti-clericalism of the time that the neighbours and even some relatives tried to persuade him to give up the priesthood: boys threw stones at him: girls paraded obscenities in his presence; he was calumniated even in his home. And how pay the seminary-pension? Pious friends helped towards that. From 1903 to 1907 he was sacristan—"not one cloth awry—no speck of dust—not one candle crooked." (And we, who had thought that there was always an ecclesiastical angle for Italian altar-candles . . .!) Well, the care of the chapel was a symbol of his guarded innocence and the adornment of his soul.

The boy may have thought of the Jesuit novitiate; certainly, about the Oratorians, very strong at Biella: but the Strona parish priest persuaded the bishop to nominate him *vice-parocco* of his hometown, and thither he went, having been ordained on June, 29th, 1907. It was symptomatic that the bishop, whose first ordination it was, got confused. "This," said Oreste, "is how you anoint my hands . . ." At Strona, the parish priest gave him free scope: he became the 'soul' of the parish. "This," was the significant comment, "is a real priest!" Later, it was said that what saved a vocation was not Don Oreste the confessor, the preacher, but his *priestly personality*. Not that this preserved him from new and brutal calumnies, a torment to his exceptionally sensitive soul. But so sure of him was the bishop that in 1909 he appointed him—aged 26!—Spiritual Director of the two Biella seminaries.

He was appalled by his new responsibility, but brought with him all his candour, cheerfulness and lack of spiritual pedantry. The only fault alleged against him was that he *would* go about—even out of doors—without his biretta. . . . Our hatless generation would have absolved him. But his simplicity did not mean over-familiarity; still less, slovenliness. Perhaps his shyness corrected a slight tendency, when he talked, to over-talk. His best influence was silent, like that of sunlight, pervasive, though no sound is heard. He was the adequate refutation of the myth that only a soul that has sinned can 'understand' sinners. It is more true that the pure in heart 'see' not only God, but into the hearts of men. And his patience and imperturbable kindness were not 'negative,' but due to virile self-mastery, itself due to union with God.

From 1916 to 1919 Don Oreste, in grey-green uniform, served as infirmarian-chaplain in a vast Turin hospital. The series of his

photographs begins with a small rather fragile boy with huge eyes (these always remained, steady and very direct) and outstanding ears (which finally quieted down somewhat, having been much derided . . .). The ecclesiastical portraits show a broad forehead, the same clear eyes, a firm kindly mouth, a short nose—a burly sort of head! The army photo is the sturdier for a thick clipped moustache. His service as priest and infirmarian was long remembered and blessed.

He returned. The enormous seminary, like our country-houses, had been gutted by its military occupants: anticlericalism raged worse than before—parents hardly dared send their sons there: its finances were desperate; post-war indiscipline sent even the pages of theological text books rustling. The load was too great: he fell sick; an operation, and a pilgrimage of the whole seminary to Our Lady of Oropa saved him for a time.

The occupations of a seminary Spiritual Director may seem rather monochrome, even if he have as many external activities connected with lay societies, convents and so forth as Don Oreste had. Characteristic little anecdotes fill the greater part of *Don Oreste Fontanella*:¹ they reveal his charity and justice, prudence and enterprise, love of freedom within order, and that 'pawkiness' of Italian humour which eludes the northerner ready to perceive Italian love of art and up-rushes of emotion. But none can fail to note the simple Italian use of the Name of 'Jesus', where we, more shyly, maybe, would say 'Our Lord', or speak of serving or 'pleasing God'. In this 'life' we keep reading that Don Oreste's method, smile, heart were those of Jesus. And the impression left upon us is that this was true. He died after a brief illness on March 26th, 1935. The whole populace seemed to follow this quiet, hidden priest to his grave.

I chose these three men, partly because they may be little known here, and to suggest how they—not alone, yet eminently among a constellation of heroes—maintained or restored a noble tradition in Italy's tortured times, and to win, please God, loving prayers for that land whose future seems destined to be not less troubled.

C. C. MARTINDALE

SHORT NOTICE

Those who have seen, or tried to get up, Fr. Drinkwater's plays will welcome *The Five Joyful Mysteries* just re-published at 1s. by The Sower, Lower Gorval, Dudley. Each mystery would take about twenty minutes to act. Spiritual profit to both actors and audience is assured; for these little plays teach not only doctrine, but reverence for sacred persons and truths.

¹ By Canon A. Viotto; pp. 277. Turin, 1940.

MISCELLANEA

CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

A PRE-COLUMBAN CHURCH IN AMERICA

THAT there was some contact between the American Continent and Europe prior to the voyage of discovery by Christopher Columbus is, I imagine, no new theory. What that contact was—how significant or how slight—is another and more complicated question.

My attention has been called to a book recently published in the United States, with the title of *America: 1355-1364*. Its author is a Norwegian scholar, long resident in the U.S.A., Dr. Hjalmar R. Holand, who studied the problem of American pre-history for many years with Mr. Philip Ainsworth Means.¹

The book considers the origin of certain remains to be found in Newport, on Narragansett Bay, in the South of the Cape Cod peninsula of Rhode Island. These are the ruins of a round tower which were there, it is argued, when the first English settlers arrived in the seventeenth century. Previously, little attention was paid to these remains, on the ground that they formed part of a windmill erected by the English during the seventeenth century.

More than a century ago the Danish scholar Rafn suggested that this round tower belonged to an ancient Norman construction and that it dated from the eleventh century. The suggestion inspired Longfellow to compose a romantic poem with this tower as its centre, interpreted as the citadel of a band of Northern knights. But on the whole the new interpretation was not accepted. The theory prevailed that the building was a portion of a windmill erected by the English Governor, Arnold, at the time of the earliest English settlement.

The suggestion of Rafn was taken up in 1910 and 1911 by two scholars, Enlart, a Frenchman, and Frölen, a Swede, both of whom declared that the tower showed several signs of ecclesiastical origin. Means and Holand have more recently carried this suggestion further and produced serious arguments for this interpretation.

They argued that the eight large columns, on which the building was established, correspond to the eight points of the compass—a coincidence which would scarcely be looked for in the construction of a windmill. And then, above the columns can be detected a series of *arches*—again hardly to be expected in a windmill. Besides, there is now evidence that this Newport Tower was in existence long before the period of office of Governor Arnold. In a letter dated 1642 is contained a reference to the "old windmill". The first English settlers arrived in the Newport district for the first time in 1639, so that it appears highly probable that the building was there prior to their advent. An old map of the year 1634 shows signs of a settlement in these parts in previous centuries.

Recent examination of the Newport Tower suggests that it closely resembles the round church of St. Olaf in Tunsberg, Norway. One can discover within it the spot where an altar once stood. In addition

¹ Some account of the pre-Columban Catholic church which Dr. Holand claims to have discovered in North America may be found in *Stimmen der Zeit*, for January, 1948. It is from the article in *Stimmen* that this short note has been, in the main, taken.

there are marked similarities, in the upper portion, between this Newport Tower and a number of medieval churches in Southern Sweden. The approach to this upper story was by means of ladders. A similar construction is found in twenty-one Swedish churches of the Middle Ages, in which the upper portion of the church was used as a place of refuge by the local population in case of attack. In eighteen of these Swedish churches the church door was to the south-west ; this again is true of the Newport Tower. The presence in the upper story of a chimney communicating with the outer air is one more indication that these places might be required for a lengthy stay.

The general conclusion of these scholars, based upon a comparison between this tower and similar buildings in Scandinavia, is that it is a construction of the fourteenth century. Dr. Holand has given convincing reasons to prove that a considerable number of Swedes and Norwegians made the long journey from their home countries to North America about A.D. 1360. There is evidence from a Rune stone, found in 1898 in Minnesota, that this Scandinavian expedition penetrated as far inland as Minnesota in 1362. It is likely that the headquarters of this expedition was encamped in what is to-day Newport, and that they there established a Catholic church on the familiar model of their own Scandinavian churches.

"What Song the *Syrens* sang," wrote Sir Thomas Browne, "or what name *Achilles* assumed when he hid himself among Women, though puzzling Questions, are not beyond all conjecture". Perhaps, one day, we shall learn more of these pre-Columban contacts between the New World and the Old.

JOHN MURRAY

PICTURES IN CHALK AND WATERCOLOUR

AT first sight the pictures by David Jones recently exhibited at the Redfern Gallery appear rather difficult to understand ; they do not reveal themselves to the observer at what is the usual "range" of perhaps eight feet. They seem a tangled mass of pale colour and writhing line. Here and there, in paintings of heads, the main form of the picture is immediately self-evident, but even in these greater satisfaction will be found upon closer scrutiny.

These studies need to be closely and intricately examined, for the artist works intimately with the paper, exploring it with great care and delicacy. Perhaps it would be best to liken him to the illuminator of manuscripts who would surround a capital letter with support figures and foliage. In many of his pictures the main 'motif' is a large and sprawling tree into which is woven birds and flowers, thorns and nails ; beyond there will be ruins, soldiers, stone-circles and snatches of landscape. With a sensitive line we are taken on a journey into a world which the artist has evolved from his own rather mystic experience. How far we can know that world depends not only upon our being willing to make the journey but also on the extent to which the symbols used have any meaning for us.

It becomes increasingly clear that the manner of execution of this work holds a place secondary to that of the ideas which the artist desires to present. That these ideas and feelings are arranged with lucidity is a tribute to the æsthetic sensitivity and the sound craftsmanship of their creator.

Having said that the artist uses certain 'themes' around which these pictures are built I had better state what seem to be the main starting-points. Firstly there are the more symbolic works, such as "Vexilla Regis", "The Lady", and "Arbor Alta"; secondly there are the monumental heads, such as "Two Girls observed at the Mass", "Dwynwen Deg in Livia's Frock", and "The wife of the Vicar of Britain"; lastly there are works that seem to have been made directly before nature: "The leafless tree", "Winter afternoon looking towards the playing fields of Harrow", "The First Tree", and others.

It would seem that direct work under the inspiration of nature does not give this artist his greatest stimulus. The paintings so executed lack the force and directness which is characteristic of the more 'compounded' pictures. An exception is "Brief record of bird on bough" in which the powerful thrust of the bird's head has been seized and recorded with masterly directness and economy of line. Nevertheless it does seem that the line which is so purposeful when drawing horses in "Vexilla Regis" is less at ease when describing "The playing fields of Harrow".

When, however, Mr. Jones is excited by *people*, he sees them with a simplicity and monumentality which does not detract from their essentially human qualities. In the drawings of the heads of girls at the Mass there is a sensitivity of line used to convey volume which is a characteristic of good draughtsmanship. "The wife of the Vicar of Britain" is another example of a work in which the feeling of volume is strong and with it a certain caustic comment upon the subject; it might be called "Caesar's Wife".

"The lord of Venedotia, of the house of Cunedda Gwledig . . ." seems to form a suitable bridge from the monumental to the more detailed and symbolic work in this exhibition. The central figure is in the same manner as those described above, whilst the surrounding and supporting elements are more akin to works like "The Lady". Symbols such as the hawk, celtic jewellery, horses with barbaric trappings, and hut dwellings are described with great love, and set the figure in a definite celtic patterning stated in the dynastic title. The understanding of these pictures, mystic in quality, depends very largely upon the extent to which the symbols used have meaning for the spectator. It is likely that they will be best understood by those of the same Faith as the artist. For example, thorns, nails, doves, remains of classical buildings, even the pegs supporting the post in "Vexilla Regis" have a place in the imagery used by the Church since the earliest times. But a combination of familiar signs with fragments of contemporary life presents a problem to the observer. In "The Lady" much of the vision is expressed in these terms. What is the implication behind this vast figure supported, and almost adored, by the two soldiers? What is the meaning of this architectural setting, these machine-guns, this tumultuous landscape with its helmeted horseman and distant trawler? Why the central figure, chained and be-ringed?

The answer may become clearer upon greater consideration, when we reflect that this and two other paintings were made whilst the war was still upon us. The anguish and horror at the shocks of the early days are here vividly expressed through a man's inner vision instead of by their outward manifestations. These personal symbols may mean less to us now than they will in the future when we are further from the struggle in time.

If we turn back from these studies to the paintings previously described they seem to have an air as of happiness at the horror passed.

Mr. Jones achieves a fusion between those things of the past which have meaning for him, and a keen realisation of contemporary life. Throughout the exhibition there is evidence of a man with great sensitivity expressing an intensely personal vision.

DAVID TINKER

THE FRANCO-BRITISH LIFE EXHIBITION

THE exhibition *Huit siècles de vie franco-britannique* at the Musée Galliera in Paris is finely arranged and obtains the success it deserves. The guide book gives an excellent summary of the relations between two peoples united by so many common remembrances and ties of kinship.

There are a few regrettable omissions. Why is there nothing about William the Conqueror, about Joan of Arc, about the English Colleges at Rheims, Douay and St. Omer? About the introduction into France of freemasonry and rationalistic ideas by the Scottish Jacobites? About Chateaubriand, a refugee in England during the Revolution, later on the French ambassador in London and the translator of *Paradise Lost*? Why hardly anything about Victor Hugo, perhaps the most intuitive critic of Shakespeare? Why hardly anything about Shakespeare's immense influence on French literature and art since 1750? To be sure the English gardens, the English tea, the English horses and jockeys are interesting things, but the universal worship of the French for Shakespeare is of higher interest. Another omission: Newman's influence on all our intellectuals, Catholic or non-Catholic.

Among the portraits in the exhibition I should like to mention that of Mary Stuart and her first husband, King François II; the portraits of Henriette de France, the wife of Charles I, and of her daughter, Henriette d'Angleterre, the sister-in-law of Louis XIV, both very pretty women, the mother perhaps prettier than the daughter; above all the portrait of Lord Byron by Gericault, truly the *beau ténébreux*, the Don Juan whom no woman was able to resist.

PIERRE MESSIAEN

SHORT NOTICE

It is a happy sign when laymen are competent and willing to write books upon theology, for a Catholic life is built up not only out of good behaviour and devoutness, but also intellectually. We might risk saying that a man's intelligence ought to be as active about his faith as about his business. It is also a happy thing when a book like this one (*Christ In His Mystical Body*: by C. J. Woollen. Pp. 175. 6s. net. Sands and Co. 1948,) refutes the almost heretical statement that we hear so often—that some doctrines are 'too high' for the ordinary man. All the great dogmas which combine to form the complete doctrine of the Mystical Body of our Lord were preached to very simple people, many of them fresh from paganism, by St. Paul. The idea that there is a sort of 'inner ring' of illuminated Christians to whom lofty doctrine may be administered, perhaps, in retreats, but not from the pulpit, is a detestable and theosophic one, and alien to the Catholic faith.

REVIEWS

THE GOEBBELS DIARIES¹

THE story of these recovered papers is a fascinating one. When the Russians entered Berlin in 1945, they ransacked the German archives. Some material they removed ; some was destroyed ; much was left lying about in confusion amid the bomb-shattered courts and corridors of the various ministries. Individual Germans gathered up these unwanted documents and sold them as waste paper for a few marks. Among the papers bundled together and sold for a slight sum were seven thousand loose sheets ; these passed from hand to hand till it was discovered that they were part of a detailed diary, kept by Reichsminister Josef Goebbels. Out of these papers, some badly burnt and others damaged, Mr. Louis P. Lochner, for twenty years the chief representative of the Associated Press in Berlin, has made the selection which we have here, in German and in English, under the title of *The Goebbels Diaries*.

Goebbels was in the habit of dictating every day his impressions of the war situation on the various fronts and his judgment of the domestic position inside Germany. He reported and commented upon his interviews with Hitler and other members of the Nazi Party, with distinguished foreign visitors to Germany, and he gave very frank opinions of his colleagues, sometimes in trenchant words. It is doubtful whether he had time to read what he had dictated, for there are many repetitions. Whether he composed these pages for eventual publication or not, it is difficult to say. Such an intention might be one explanation of his glowing praise of Hitler. Yet he could scarcely have published the *Diaries* as Mr. Lochner has published them, with their caustic remarks about high-ranking military men and Nazi officials, without a great deal of preliminary expurgation.

The *Diaries*, as we have them, are from the years, 1942 and 1943. In the former year, they comprise the periods from January 21st to March 2nd, March 26th to April 9th, April 11th until May 23rd, and December the 7th to the 20th. For 1943, they are fuller, though by no means complete, including the weeks from March the 1st to the 20th, April 9th until the 1st of May, May 7th to 28th, July 25th to 29th, September 28th to 30th, November 1st to 4th, 6th to 22nd, and 24th to 30th, December 4th to 9th. Even in this reduced form, and after the editing of Mr. Lochner, the extracts make up, in the German and the American edition, a volume of more than five hundred pages.

It is fascinating to read this commentary upon the war, from the other side, and from the man who was in charge of all the German propaganda and was in effect in control of the city of Berlin. The comments are often very shrewd and objective despite the obviously blind spots. Hitler can do no wrong, in his minister's eyes. For the Jews there is nothing to be said and, though he rarely rants and rages in these pages, the "little Doctor" is ready to be thoroughly ruthless with them. It is only the German people under Nazi leadership and in the spirit which war has evoked from them, that could have the *courage* to deal with the Jews as Goebbels thinks they must be dealt with.

¹ (1) *Goebbels Tagebücher*. Edited by Louis P. Lochner. Zürich : Atlantis Verlag. Pp. 528. 1948. (2) *The Goebbels Diaries*. Edited by Louis P. Lochner. Garden City, New York : Doubleday and Co., Inc. Pp. 566. Price, \$4.00. 1948.

Day after day he assesses the situation to East and West very coolly. The pages for early 1942 are optimistic, but he never commits himself to any statement that Russia will be defeated during the 1942 campaigns. He studies alarmist reports about conditions inside Russia, but thinks them, on the whole, exaggerated, and discounts much of their contents. He appreciates the Russian faculty for military improvisation which he considers far higher than that of the German generals, for the majority of whom he has indeed little respect. Even in early 1942 he is considerably worried by a spirit of *defeatism* that is showing itself among senior military officers and generally in German upper and conservative classes—a reality little realised in Britain during the war but which has been made very clear through the revelations of the Nuremberg trials. The main opposition both to the war and the Nazi Party came precisely from these sections of German society. He admires the British spirit but is inclined to undervalue Churchill's abilities, as he fails also to understand Churchill's great hold on the people of Britain during the war. Occasionally, his judgment goes completely astray, as when he refuses to be alarmed by the immense industrial possibilities for war production of the United States.

Goebbels writes clearly, and indeed very well. He is a born *diarist*, and these pages may survive, not only as one of the most interesting of war commentaries but as a work of German letters. A good diarist reveals himself in his diary, and Goebbels is no exception. He is seen as a hard worker and proud of his work; sensitive particularly to Hitler's reactions to his propaganda, and definitely vain. He records his pleasure when his articles in the *Reich* are praised in military circles, and notes how they are appreciated abroad, even in countries of the enemy. Vanity was a weak point, and a little flattery would make him alter, perhaps distort, a previous judgment. A case in point is that of King Boris of Bulgaria. Goebbels had formerly thought of Boris as an untrustworthy man, playing a doubtful or double game. But when Boris visited Berlin he asked for an interview with Goebbels. The interview was scheduled for 20 minutes but it lasted more than an hour. The Bulgarian king assured Goebbels that the leading articles in the *Reich* were his favourite reading, that he used their arguments in discussion with his political and military chiefs in Bulgaria; and he told Goebbels that he was quite sure that Germany would never have collapsed in 1918, had Goebbels then been Propaganda minister in Germany. Goebbels was entirely disarmed and won over. In the diary for March 28th, 1942, he notes: "He is really a people's king . . . an enthusiastic admirer of Hitler's genius for leadership—and most sympathetic". But, for all these human foibles, Goebbels is cold-blooded and ruthless. He is wise enough to see that it is foolish to raise, for instance, religious difficulties during the war, but is equally determined to raise them and solve them, in a rough and cruel Nazi manner, when the war is won.

A consecutive reading of these *Diaries* shows the change of the German temper and atmosphere as the relative optimism of early 1942 deepens to the anxieties of late 1943: the losses in North Africa, the defection of Italy, and the Italian campaigns. Noticeable is Goebbels' preoccupation with the increasing Anglo-American air raids and the terrible damage he admits they have been causing. In one place he speaks of the remarkable "precision bombing of the R.A.F.", and he has to grant the efficiency of the British secret service in Germany made evident by the accurate British estimates of the damage the raids have caused. Though generally on terms of friendship with Göring he wishes that Göring had worked harder to develop

the Luftwaffe after its successes of 1939 and 1940, and he complains that Göring is not properly acquainted with the damage from Allied air attacks or with the effects on German morale of the massed attacks. He does not hesitate to advocate terror air attacks on Britain, to be directed not against industrial plants but upon the houses of the people, principally those of the wealthier classes. Throughout the *Diaries* one is conscious of a deepening seriousness. The bright summer air of early 1942 becomes the wind-swept and leaf-strewn autumn of later 1943, which is already the herald of the winter *Götterdämmerung* of 1944 and 1945.

Goebbels was born and educated as a Catholic, but soon after his entry into the Nazi Party severed his connection with the Church. However, when he was ill in April, 1943, it was to a Catholic hospital, staffed by nursing sisters, that he chose to go. "In this St. Hedwig's hospital", he wrote, "I have personal evidence of the extraordinary competence and splendid direction of a religious hospital of this kind. I am thoroughly glad that I have prevented them in Berlin from shutting up religious hospitals. They provide a very great service; and the nuns ought to be left in peace to care for the sick. Here they can do no harm. On the contrary, they are real benefactors for suffering humanity" (German edition, p. 301).

His attitude towards the religious bodies, and in particular towards the Catholic Church, is one of temporary tolerance, tolerance at any rate while the war continues. He strongly reacts against Rosenberg's attempts to open religious issues, and declares that the religious question has been stupidly handled by some of the leading Nazis. But the tolerance is for a time, and then—the Church will be roughly handled. For February 19th, 1942, there is this comment: "The Catholic Church is again behaving in a thoroughly nasty manner. I have just been shown a number of pastoral letters, which are completely out of touch with realities and completely hostile to the State. . . . Nevertheless we shall do nothing about it now. The priests can make as much noise as they like. But after the war we shall send in our bill to them" (p. 94). On March 27th he remarks: "These political priests (*Pfaffen*) are, after the Jews, the most unpleasant scum that we have to shelter in the Reich to-day. When the war is over, we shall have to tackle this question. There can be only one power within the State—the Church or the State itself. Here it is the task of National Socialism to undertake a ruthless policy against the political claims of the churches" (p. 141). On April 5th, he states that he has asked Hitler to forbid the visits of German soldiers to the Vatican. These visits have become a serious danger. "The Pope naturally takes every occasion to receive German soldiers and tries to impress them with the ceremonial pomp of the Vatican. Besides, the present Pope is clever enough to mix no evident propaganda with these audiences. He speaks very fluent German, and his whole manner makes a significant impression upon simple soldiers, and especially upon officers" (pp. 152-3). He is angered (April 11th) to learn that the Holy Father has sent a letter to the Catholic bishops in Spain asking them to do all they can to keep Spain neutral. "He bases this request on humanitarian grounds"—comments Goebbels—"but in point of fact it reveals his hostility to the Axis. It is perfect nonsense that a religious and ecclesiastical authority should interfere so openly in political and military matters. After the war, we will have to take measures, at least in our own country, that interferences of this sort are made absolutely impossible" (p. 157).

The Goebbels Diaries are a remarkable commentary on formidable historical events, interesting in what they say and in the light they throw on war-time Germany, and on the Nazi mind.

J. M.

THE VOCABULARY OF PHILOSOPHY¹

IN his *History of Philosophy* Hegel remarks that whereas up to the time of Kant educated people had been able to understand philosophy and had considered that some knowledge of it pertained to a man of culture, Kant's "intricate idealism" made it inaccessible to all but the professional philosopher. Fichte, Hegel continues, separated philosophic thought even more sharply from the "common consciousness". Hegel's remarks are doubtless true so far as the German idealists are concerned, and one might speak in an analogous way of the modern logicians, whose writings cannot be really understood without some special training; but unless one is prepared to identify philosophy with logical analysis, one must admit that there is to-day a widespread interest in the problems of philosophy, at least in so far as these problems have an obvious bearing on human life. This is only to be expected in an age when so many possess no firm theological belief. The problem of God and the problem of values, for instance, are real problems for a great many people, though a considerable proportion of these are unfamiliar with philosophic terminology and with the concepts employed in the philosophic discussion of such problems. There is, therefore, a real place for a philosophical dictionary which explains philosophic concepts briefly but clearly and which gives some trustworthy suggestions for further reading and study. As far as the German-speaking public is concerned this need has been admirably met by Father Walter Brugger, S.J., and his collaborators. It is interesting to note that one of these collaborators is British, namely, Father D. A. Steele, S.J., of Edinburgh, who is an accomplished mathematician and has contributed articles on the philosophy of mathematics and the concept of number.

The greater part of the book is devoted to the alphabetically arranged treatment of concepts and subjects; but this is followed by an outline of the history of philosophy, which includes oriental as well as western thinkers and movements. When the doctrine of a particular philosopher has been dealt with in the first part, a cross-reference is given; otherwise a very brief summary of the doctrine is given under the philosopher's name. For instance, under the name of Scotus in the history of philosophy section a reference is given to the article on Scotism, whereas under the name of Schopenhauer a brief summary of his philosophy is supplied. There are two indices. An index of concepts and subjects is given at the beginning and an index of proper names at the end of the volume. Directions for the use of the dictionary and an explanatory list of abbreviations are also provided.

I suppose that it is true to say that in Germany and France man himself has become the centre of philosophic interest. The value of Father Brugger's work is thus greatly enhanced by the articles on such subjects as Man, Spirit, Culture, Philosophy of Culture, Conscience, Freedom, Philosophy

¹ *Philosophisches Wörterbuch*. Unter Mitwirkung der Professoren des Berchman-Kollegs in Pullach bei München und anderer herausgegeben von Walter Brugger, S.J. Vienna, Thomas-Morus-Press im Verlag Herder, 1948. Pp. xlii, 532. Price, S 38; sfrs. 16.50.

of Value, Philosophy of Religion, Psychology of Religion. Moreover, the book is, in general, thoroughly up to date, including, as it does, living non-German philosophers like Sartre, Lavelle, Marcel, Le Senne, Abbagnano. English readers would find useful the explanation of terms used by writers like Dilthey and Husserl, whose writings are not particularly well known in this country. There are, however, some misspellings. Though the name Whitehead is correctly spelt in the index it appears elsewhere as Withehead, while Rickaby and Tyndall, spelt correctly in the index, are given elsewhere as Rikkaby and Tyndell respectively. One may also mention that *Process and Reality*, the most important philosophical publication by Whitehead, should be included in the list of his works. Possibly it is somewhat surprising to find Cardinal Newman placed under the heading "Neoscholasticism"; but no doubt there can be a legitimate difference of opinion on that point.

As regards the treatment of philosophical ideas the aim of the editor and his collaborators has been to present in an objective and connected manner the ideas which have entered into the western philosophical tradition and which are living ideas in modern philosophy. They have not treated philosophic concepts atomistically, but have tried to throw into relief their philosophic relevance and their organic connections. The book is, therefore, no mere lexicon of philosophical terms, nor is it a happy hunting-ground for philosophic antiquarians; it is indeed a dictionary, but it is also a philosophical work in its own right. While observing the requirements of objectivity, the authors have not excluded appreciative or critical judgments. This is no drawback, since it enables the reader to form a correct idea of the problem under consideration and helps him to bring his own critical powers into play. In his Foreword Father Brugger speaks of the need for a philosophical dictionary which would treat the problems of modern philosophy and of the present day in the spirit of the western tradition "which culminates in the names of a Plato, an Aristotle, an Augustine and a Thomas Aquinas", and this need he has endeavoured to supply. Some people would say that this attitude indicates "bias" and that it does not fulfil the requirements of "objectivity"; but if a philosophical dictionary is going to handle philosophical problems in a philosophical manner, then so called "bias", namely a point of view, cannot be avoided. And, as a matter of fact, is there an author of a philosophical dictionary of any value who entirely excludes a point of view? To take an example more or less at random. If one looks up the article on the proofs for God's existence in a non-Catholic dictionary like that of H. Schmidt, one finds a point of view: indeed, Professor Schmidt openly admits, in his Foreword, that he has written from a certain point of view and that he hopes that his dictionary will help in the dissemination of his particular philosophical outlook. Why, then, should one accuse Father de Vries, for example, of "bias" because he has written his article on the proofs of God's existence for Father Brugger's dictionary from a certain point of view? Both Father de Vries and Professor Schmidt have tried to give an objective presentation of the proofs as commonly stated; but each has written from his own standpoint. As both authors are philosophers, and not mere reporters, this is only to be expected; and if a non-Catholic philosopher is not accused of bias because he does not exclude appreciative and critical judgments from his articles, there is no reason why a Catholic philosopher should be so accused.

There is an interesting though inevitably brief article on *Existenzphilosophie*

by Father Lotz, and its value is increased by the fact that the author adopts a definite attitude in regard to German existentialism. He evidently looks on it as genuine philosophy, and he sympathises with its concrete approach to philosophy. While insisting, in opposition to the Hegelian preoccupation with the Absolute, on the concrete reality of the individual man, the philosophy of existence gives depth and seriousness to the idea of man by emphasizing his freedom; man is a free subject, not a mere object or item in the world. At the same time Father Lotz does not lose sight of the danger to which the philosophy of existence is exposed, namely that of insisting so much on subjectivity that the way is closed to a new approach to the problem of Being. In his article on *Transzendenz* Father Lotz points out that the philosophy of existence has rediscovered the Transcendent, even though the idea of the Transcendent in Jaspers' philosophy is more or less "empty" and Heidegger's idea of Being is indeterminate.

This very sensible attitude towards modern philosophical developments, the attitude of friendly openness of mind to positive values, coupled with an alertness to discern one-sided exaggerations, is characteristic of the dictionary as a whole. For example, Father Brugger realises the positive value of logic, while at the same time he insists that the modern developments of logic have not rendered the Aristotelian logic simply superfluous or, still less, exposed it as erroneous, and he draws attention to the fact that the use of modern logic in the interests of positivism constitutes a misuse of modern logic. Father Brugger and his collaborators are to be warmly congratulated on their achievement in the production of this dictionary. I do not know of any comparable English publication of this type which has appeared to date.

F. C. C.

A NEW LIFE OF ST. JANE-FRANCES¹

WE welcome this Life of a Saint of whom few save friends of the Visitation know much; and even priests may remember chiefly that she has a very long Collect. This is another example of a Saint's Life being written in a way that ordinary readers can appreciate. The author makes very clear the forthrightness, the impetuosity, of this great Burgundian lady, and the contrast between her and St. Francis de Sales—though not at all 'meek and gentle' (p. 74) but, shall we say, a cautious though sensitive Savoyard—is well stressed. Jeanne, in the hunting-field, would no doubt have wished Francis to leap all the hedges in front of them: but he, meanwhile, was looking for gates. . . . Just in proportion as this is not an erudite 'life' for specialists, we would have liked rather more vivid little details to have been introduced. We hear that, as a girl, she was hostile to Huguenots: I like to be told that she dared not take her riding-mask off lest her eyes should be seen red with crying over the devastation they had worked. (Yet she said of herself that she was still 'fille à toute folie'—up to every trick.) We hear how she loved her husband, but not that she rattled the curtain-rings and then held a candle under his nose if he *still* wouldn't get up for Mass. We hear that St. Francis de Sales noticed her while he was preaching and 'asked what her name was', but not, that he really said: "Who was the young widow with the bright

¹ *St. Jane Frances de Chantal*. By Janet Mary Scott. Sands and Co. Pp. 112. 5s. net. 1948.

brown hair" (*claire-brune*)? It is worth remembering that Jeanne's problem about her children was solved *for* her. When she approached her father to speak about her vocation, he pointed out that her daughter Marie-Aimée was already 'arranged for'—the two younger girls were to go to the Ursulines, and he had 'arranged for' Celse-Bénigne also. I don't believe much in the boy's anguish when she was leaving and he laid himself down 'with incomparable gracefulness' for her to step over him; and am I wrong in thinking that when he left his Easter Mass, 'in black velvet slippers', for a duel, it was to serve as second to his friend Bouteville? True, he fought, and Jeanne was sure he would be beheaded (as Bouteville was) and prepared to go to help him to die well, but he returned to court as though nothing had happened. *Il se moquait de tout le monde*. Ironical, that he should have been the father of Mme de Sévigné, of whom everyone knows, yet what was she, compared with Jeanne de Chantal, of whom so few know? And ought we to say that St. Francis 'anticipated' St. Margaret Mary, and not rather that she followed after him? Not only was the 'crest' (duly mentioned) 'the Heart of Jesus and Mary' (*cet unique coeur*), but his Sisters were to be indeed 'Daughters of the Sacred Heart'—to say nothing of the writings of St. John Eudes. The humble Visitation nun was chosen to be the *apostle* of the devotion in which the tradition of her Order had long been steeped. We must be forgiven if we make this plea for a little more such 'colouring-matter' in a second edition for which we sincerely hope, in which too the accents might be rather less erratic, and Jeanne must not call St. Francis 'Monsignori' (p. 31): Fr. de Villars (p. 33) is Villers on p. 34; M. de Toulangeon too often ends in an *s*, and there are a few other misprints (e.g. Jeane, p. 38) which can easily be cleared up. The book is far too good to be allowed to suffer from such small blemishes, especially as it does us the great service of showing that Jeanne, though impetuous and spiritually most robust, was not a masculine, 'managing' woman, as some of her biographers suggest. Her storm-tossed life, after a period of incredible desolation, ended in perfect peace.

C. C. M.

SHORT NOTICES

It requires no special gifts of insight and divination to be sure that a great deal in the future history of the world and of the Catholic Church will depend on the character of the Japanese people. At present the prospects seem bright, though there is a cloud, as yet no bigger than a man's hand, lowering on the horizon, the menace of Communism. How solidly are the hopes for Christianity of General MacArthur and those who think with him, including the Catholic missionaries, based? This is the main question dealt with in Mr. Horner's admirable little book, a book in a thousand, the result of fourteen years of life and study in Japan, **A Case History of Japan**, by Francis J. Horner (London, Sheed and Ward, pp. 227. Price: 10s. 6d. net.). The author traces in masterly fashion the effect on Japanese character of the great historical impacts, racial, cultural, political, and shows how none of them has been able to deliver this great dynamic people from the sense of incompleteness which is the clue to

their restlessness, their constant questing for some new thing, and even their occasional savagery. They have been, in fact, throughout their history, a frustrated people, needing, because human, a satisfying ideal and unable to find it. The nearest they have ever come to it was in the worship of a person, their Emperor. But the Emperor has now at last shed his "cloak of divinity," and there is a vacuum which only another divine and human Person can fill, the Person of Christ. The Japanese have shown in the past in their thousands of glorious martyrs, what the love of Jesus could do to bring them the peace and sense of completion which apart from Him they have never known. There is none in time or eternity to compete with Him, and this great nation which once rejected Him is now waking up to the tremendous fact. Mr. Horner's analysis of all the factors in the complex problem is wonderfully satisfying. He has shirked none of the dark corners in his historical approach, and when it comes to psychological interpretation, there is a sobriety and sureness of touch rarely found in other books about Japan. There is also a very attractive modesty. No Catholic reading this splendid book but will be impelled to pray for the most gifted of Eastern peoples, especially that God may lead their Emperor to the feet of Jesus Christ.

The "Young Christian Workers" have done well to publish the series of enquiries which is entitled **The Mass in My Life and My Life in the Mass** which Cardinal Griffin blesses in a laudatory preface. The booklet (to be obtained at 1s. from 106 Clapham Road, S.W.9) is well arranged to provide matter for study, discussion and even research over several months. It is never merely academic; in fact one of its wise aims seems to be the removal of ignorant weariness or boredom when assisting at the greatest of the Holy Mysteries.

Sound teaching on such important subjects as Prayer, Temptation, Almsgiving and Charity, or on such little-considered yet often disputed matters as Money, Riches, Suffering and Marriage will be found in **Christ's Way**, by Mother Mary Simeon, S.H.C.J. (Douglas Organ. 7s. 6d.) Of course the value of such a book must depend upon meditation by its readers (on the lines admirably indicated by the author) of the truths which it explains. The volume has a useful foreword by Bishop Flynn of Lancaster. The matter is very varied, the thought and opinions are wide and suggestive. In these days of Study and Discussion Clubs *Christ's Way* would seem to be a desirable book to have on the agenda for consideration.

In the judgment of the problems aroused by the developments of artificial insemination, it is the moralist who has the last word, for he alone sees man whole. The lawyer and the doctor see but an aspect, that of their own science. This small brochure **L'Isémination artificielle** (Paris, Lethielleux, 1948; 100 fr.) in which are gathered papers by doctors, theologians and others under the auspices of the Centre d'études Laënnec will be welcome to all who wish to take part in the debate which, for all its recondite details, is ultimately one that touches the true dignity of man. The Congress of Catholic doctors that is to meet in Rome in April, 1949, will be concerned with this amongst other problems.

Mr. Radcliffe has set out to enlarge the 'Young Conservative' idea in his series of lectures on the art of enthraling audiences. The book (**Public Speaking**. Falcon Press. 7s. 6d.) is short, and written in a simple manner. It would appear from the general content that Mr. Radcliffe has either underestimated his audience or is addressing himself to boys and girls of

School Certificate standard. The cover advertisement suggests that the writer hopes to blaze a new trail in the pedagogy of public speaking, but the contents of the book scarcely justify any such claims. Very little is said that has not been said before, and the selections from modern speakers serve only to illustrate the wisdom of Mr. Churchill in basing his own approach to the art on masters of the past. The best preparation for successful public speaking is, in fact, a real familiarity with the great orators of the eighteenth century, who, because they knew their classics and had been reared on the bible, seldom failed to achieve unforgettable English in their speeches. It should be a truism for all modern aspirants to the hustings that for power, content and style it is the backward glance that is required.

The recently beatified Italian lawyer, Contardo Ferrini, was in his own day much preoccupied with the influence of Christianity on Roman law, a problem which is not arid and scholastic, but is a way to answer the desires of those who seek to rechristianize the society of to-day. How was it done the first time? How must it be done again? The two problems are clear parallels. The *Università cattolica* of Milan has devoted two volumes to the commemoration of this beatification in which much space is given to the further investigation of Ferrini's problem (*Scritti in onore di Contardo Ferrini*, Milan. 1947). Slavery and divorce did not disappear when Constantine became a Christian; the supernaturalizing of society had to be a long and painful process. Now that Western thinkers are beginning to escape from the Newtonian spell which has bound sociologists equally with scientists for so long, and to realize that society cannot be studied as a closed system without the supernatural, it is all to the good to have these signs of progress from lands where the Roman law is still the basis of society.

Although *The Voice of a Priest* (By Edward Leen, C.S.Sp. Sheed and Ward, 10s. 6d.) is the posthumous work of a fairly prolific author, its roots spread back through the whole of his life. The editor has gathered in one book a series of addresses delivered over a period of roughly twenty years which is, as those who know Fr. Leen's work will clearly recognise, representative of the whole development of his thought. In all his works it was apparent that Fr. Leen realised that once a soul had grasped, however weakly, some of the implications of the doctrine of Grace, it was more than likely that a revolution in the spiritual life would follow. Better than any he could explain that the life of Grace is the life of God in the soul and the content of sanctity, the effective election of the example of Christ Our Lord. Those attracted by Fr. Leen's other books will find the secret of that attraction repeated in this last work. The same high ascetical standard, the same lucidity of style, the same wealth of apt scriptural quotation. Since the book is a collection of addresses it should find a place on the shelves of priests burdened with the task of frequent instructional and conference work. The body of the doctrine is not suited to priests and nuns only; there is a great deal that has significance for the laity also. As examples of matter useful for sermons with a bearing on modern problems, those instructions dealing with Christ the King and the Parish Church stand out. Fr. Leen's books were read by Catholics all over the world, and the introductory essay by the editor Fr. Kelly, C.S.Sp. will be to them a source of interest and consolation.

"THE UNIVERSE"

The Leading Catholic Newspaper
merits your support.

It has faithfully and zealously served the Catholic Cause at home and abroad during the whole period of its long history 1860-1948. Its able editorials, Notes and Comments, powerful articles and unrivalled news service place it in the front rank of newspapers.

EVERY FRIDAY 2d.

Direct Subscriptions : 13s. Inland, or Abroad
per year. Inclusive of postage.

Special terms for members of His Majesty's
Forces : 10s. per year, inclusive of postage,
and *pro rata* for 6 or 3 months.

Head Office :

Field House, Breams Buildings, London,
E.C.4.

Prices net, postage extra

PRACTICE OF PERFECTION AND CHRISTIAN VIRTUES

*By Father Alphonsus Rodriguez, S.J. Translated from
the Original Spanish by Father Joseph Rickaby, S.J.*

Crown 8vo. Authorized English Edition complete in two volumes, 30s. per set ; 16s. 6d. per single volume. Volume I.—Treatises i-xi, with portrait of author, pp. xviii + 878. Volume II.—Treatises xii-xxiv. With portrait of translator, pp. xvi + 688.

MANRESA PRESS, ROEHAMPTON, S.W.

MANUAL OF PRAYERS FOR YOUTH

(SIXTIETH THOUSAND)

With the approbation of the
Archbishop of Westminster and
of the Archbishop-Bishop of
Southwark.

This excellent prayer book, an especial favourite in Catholic Colleges and Convent Schools, was entirely re-arranged by the late Father Joseph Keating, S.J., in consultation with various spiritual Authorities. The manual has been described as truly manly and practical, and appeals to all whose piety is sincere, simple and devout.

Price, 4/- net cloth boards.

LONDON :

MANRESA PRESS, ROEHAMPTON, S.W.15

SWORD OF THE SPIRIT

President :

HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL GRIFFIN
Archbishop of Westminster.

The **Sword of the Spirit** was established by Cardinal Hinsley in August, 1940,

To unite Catholics in an understanding of the spiritual issues arising from the war ;

To emphasize the need for Christian principles in social and international reconstruction ;

To call upon Catholics for more sincere **Prayer**, for more serious **Study** of the Church's teaching on social and public questions, for more energetic **Action**.

The **Sword of the Spirit** Bulletin is published every month. Price 6d.

Headquarters :—

12 CITY ROAD, LONDON, E.C.1.

TRIBUTE

to a great work being done through members.

"May I take this opportunity of sincerely thanking the C.T.S. for helping a born Catholic to realise the tremendous privilege which God has given him."

This one of many instances which could be quoted ; one item from the vast collection of evidence to the value of a work which is calling for your support.

Write TO-DAY for details of membership.

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY

38-40 Eccleston Square, London, S.W.1

THE MONTH

EDITOR REV. JOHN MURRAY, S.J.

THE MONTH was founded in July, 1864, to represent the point of view and the claims of the Catholic Faith, and it has continued to do so for more than eighty-four years. The need to fight the battles of the Church in English-speaking lands—a cause to which the periodical is wholly consecrated—was never greater, and the Editor ventures to hope that the support given to his efforts may always continue and be extended.

PUBLISHERS Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co. Ltd.,
London.

Annual subscription 20s. post free (U.S.A. \$4.50) should be sent to the Manager, Manresa Press, Roehampton, London, S.W.15

History of the Church

By **PHILIP HUGHES**

With the re-issue of the first two volumes, revised and entirely reset for this edition, together with the third volume published last year, Father Hughes's **HISTORY OF THE CHURCH** is now complete down to the Advent of Luther and the Eve of the Reformation. Of the third volume *The Times Literary Supplement* wrote:—"Fr. Hughes brings a panoply of learning to his task. Text and bibliography alike establish his depth of reading; it would be a pardonable exaggeration to say that he seems to have digested almost everything written on his subject. It is the more remarkable that he manages so skilfully the vast mass of detail at his command. His narrative is never confused, nowhere wearisome."

Volume one. **The World in which the Church Founded—A.D. 711**

21/- net

Volume two. **Augustine to Aquinas —A.D. 1274**

25/- net

Volume three. **Aquinas to Luther, A.D. 1517**

25/- net

Young Mr. Newman

By **MAISIE WARD**

21/- net

Geoffrey Faber in the **SPECTATOR**

"... No student of Newman can afford not to possess it."

"This is the Newman I have never met before. It is part of the magic of Miss Ward's book to reveal a new Newman, the boy and young man of simple, human tastes, set in a warm family circle and founded in the solid, unshaken days of the early nineteenth century."

Cecil Northcott in *John O'London's Weekly*.

SHEED & WARD, Ltd.

110/111 Fleet Street, London, E.C.4

THE CHRIST OF CATHOLICISM

A MEDITATIVE STUDY

By

Dom Aelred Graham

A Christological study of the first importance by a theological writer known on both sides of the Atlantic, in which a wholehearted acceptance of the dogmatic teaching of the "great Church" of Christendom, and the witness of the early Fathers does not preclude a sympathetic appreciation of such religious thinkers as Kierkegaard, Emil Brunner and William Temple.

2ls. net

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LTD.